

Government fully for cost arising from this destruction.

December 1964: Lima, Peru. Effort made to set off Molotov-cocktail type bomb in ladies' room of the Binational Center. Device burned but did not explode, causing only minor smoke damage. Slogan scrawled on wall in the same room. Police informed Embassy of tip to the effect that a bomb was in the Chancery. Thorough search produced nothing.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is considering morning business. Is there any further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY, JANUARY 12

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF CLOSURE RULE OF THE SENATE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the pending question, which is on agreeing to the motion to consider Senate Resolution 6, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution amending the Standing Rules of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Resolution 6 and the Douglas resolution S. 8 (to amend rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate relative to cloture) be committed to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows: That the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, which shall make its report on said resolutions to the Senate on March 9, 1965.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the request of the majority leader would protect all existing rights?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, of course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What motions must now be withdrawn in order to clear the Senate Calendar?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent those questions were taken care of, and there is no motion pending.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I withdraw the request for the quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the order for the quorum call is dissolved.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 2 remain at the desk until Tuesday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY, JANUARY 12

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon Tuesday, January 12.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Tuesday, January 12, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 11, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*Matthew 5: 6: Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled.*

Almighty God, may our noonday prayer be a sincere surrender to Thy holy will and submission to the dispensations of Thy divine providence for Thou alone canst satisfy our deepest yearnings and loftiest aspirations.

May we bring our faltering and faithless spirits into tune and harmony with Thy spirit for in the great business of useful and joyous and successful living, our own better self is continually reminding us that we were not created for failure but for victory.

Grant that when we stand at the crossroads and are smitten by fear, not knowing which way to take, we may be confident that where Thou dost guide, Thou wilt provide.

Inspire us to put ourselves on the side of that which is noble and true and may the trend and direction of our minds and hearts always bear clear and unmistakable witness that we have heard and are heeding Thy voice, "This is the way, walk ye therein."

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### AVERY STARTS TERM AS GOVERNOR OF KANSAS TODAY

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, this noon in Topeka, Kans.—12:15 Kansas time—our friend, William H. Avery, the former colleague of many in this Chamber, is being inaugurated as Governor of the great State of Kansas.

Bill Avery spent 10 distinguished years in these halls and served his district and his Nation well. In continuing a career dedicated to public service, he ran for Governor last fall and was elected chief executive of his native State.

As he takes over his duties and responsibilities today, I know that he does so with the good wishes of the Members of the House of Representatives, many of whom, I am sure, will want to join me in sending a message of congratulations and best wishes to the new Governor of Kansas, William H. Avery.

#### IMPORTS OF PETROLEUM

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a measure, which is designed to promote the general welfare, the foreign policy, and the security of the United States through the enactment of a legislative limitation upon the quantity of imports of petroleum.

In 1955, the Congress for the first time incorporated a national security provision in the Trade Act. Since that time it has become an established aspect of our foreign policy. This provision of

the law was amended and strengthened in 1958. It was reenacted as a part of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and, therefore, is an important provision of existing law—19 United States Code Annotated 1352a.

Under the national security provision, the President is delegated very broad authority which he may exercise whenever it is deemed that the national security is threatened. This authority as applied to petroleum was exercised in 1959 and since that time we have had an administrative program which limits the volume of imports of oil. We have now had almost 6 years' experience under this program. It seems to me, therefore, that it is appropriate and also advisable that, based upon this experience, the Congress should reexamine the problem and where appropriate provide the Executive with additional and more specific guidelines. I wish to hasten that this is not intended to be critical of those who are responsible for the administration of the program. It is widely recognized that the program during these past 6 years has served a most useful purpose. It has been effective in preventing a deluge of imports of oil which, had it not been for the program, would have brought chaos to the domestic petroleum industry. The administration, therefore, is to be commended for the manner in which it has exercised the authority delegated to it under the national security provision.

It is clear, however, that the present program is not fully serving its objective of keeping the domestic oil industry strong for national security reasons. The responsibility for taking corrective action first lies with the Congress. It is the duty of the Congress to provide the executive branch with proper legislative guidelines so that the policy and objective of the national security provision can be made more effective.

The need for a further strengthening of the oil import program is persuasively demonstrated by an examination of the evidence that is available relative to the exploration and development activities of the industry and the economic condition of the industry.

For the past 10 years, the domestic oil industry has suffered a continuous decline. As a result, we are not finding and developing adequate reserves of petroleum. For example, during 4 of the past 7 years, we found less crude oil than we used. Historically, the industry has found substantially more each year than was consumed and it is necessary that we do so in the future if we are to remain strong in our position as to energy.

We are adequately forewarned, therefore, that unless positive action is taken now, we will endanger the future security of the Nation.

It is the responsibility of the Congress to take cognizance of this situation and to provide the Executive with a legislative directive designed to correct the adverse trends that have plagued the domestic petroleum industry for a decade. The bill I have introduced is designed to serve this purpose. The following is a section-by-section analysis of my proposal.

At the outset, I would like to point out that the bill I have introduced does not cover imports of residual fuel oil. I know that my colleagues from coal-producing States are vitally interested in the matter of residual fuel oil and have given a great deal of study and thought to this problem. I am entirely sympathetic with those Members who are concerned about the impact of residual fuel oil imports on the coal industry but I have not endeavored to cover the matter in this bill as I defer to those who are better qualified to deal with the subject than I am.

Paragraph (e): This paragraph of the bill would limit imports of petroleum into the United States east of the Rocky Mountains to not more than 10 percent of production in that area of crude petroleum and natural gas liquids. Under the present oil import limitation program, imports into the eastern part of the United States are limited to 12.2 percent of production. Imports have been at approximately that level for the past 6 years but during this time we have seen that the domestic industry has continued to suffer depressed conditions. This experience shows that the 12.2 rate is too high if the domestic industry is to be revitalized and encouraged to find and develop enough reserves to safely provide for the future. An examination of the history of imports prior to the time that the domestic industry began its decline in the mid-1950's will show that the rate of imports previously had been for a number of years at a rate in the neighborhood of 10 percent of domestic production. For this reason, it seems to me to be logical to conclude that the present 12.2 rate is too high and that a level of 10 percent is suggested by previous experience. At present total imports of oil, excluding residual fuel oil, into the United States average about 1,500,000 barrels daily. This reduction of the 12.2 rate to 10 percent would reduce imports by about 175,000 barrels daily.

Paragraph (f): Under the present oil import limitation program, there are in effect two separate programs—one for the United States east of the Rockies and another for the United States west of the Rockies. The need for separate treatment is brought about by the fact that within the Western States there is inadequate local production as compared with consumption; whereas within the eastern part of the United States there is a large shut-in and unused surplus producing capacity. In the area west of the Rockies, under the present oil import program during the past 6 years, imports have been substantially increased. As a result, this large area has become increasingly dependent upon foreign oil—a result which is inconsistent with the security objectives of the national security provision of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and of the oil import limitation program.

In 1958, imports into the United States west of the Rockies amounted to about 20 percent of local production; whereas today, imports are more than 50 percent of local production. This is a dangerously high reliance upon foreign sources for a vital peacetime energy source and an indispensable item in time of war. Some-

thing must be done to restore the energy security position of the Western States. It is unwise to permit a large portion of our Nation to become so dependent upon an uncertain foreign source for such an important commodity. I have, therefore, included a directive to the administrators of the program to take every possible action that will encourage increased production of oil within the Western States and also an increased movement of oil from the surplus eastern portion of the Nation into the deficit western areas.

It is illogical to continue to permit the Western States to become more and more dependent on foreign sources when we have a large surplus of crude oil available in the Midcontinent States. In addition, I have included a provision which hereafter would require that if any increase over the 1964 level of imports is needed in the Western States to meet demand that a commensurate decrease be made in imports into the Eastern States. This would keep the Nation as a whole from becoming more dependent upon foreign oil.

Paragraph (g): This provision provides that hereafter imports of petroleum products would be prohibited. In other words, only crude petroleum could be imported. Historically, the United States has never been a substantial importer of oil products. In fact, we have always been a large exporter of products although in recent years exports have been less important. In addition, for many years now, the domestic refining industry has been operating at well below capacity, in the neighborhood of 80 to 90 percent. There is no need, therefore, to import finished or unfinished products. The present program, however, provides that those importers who imported products in 1957 may continue to import the same quantity as they did in that year. In other words, imports of products are frozen at the 1957 rate and those persons permitted to import are also frozen. No newcomers are permitted, only those who happened to import in 1957 are permitted to import products today. A permanent freezing of the 1957 position does not seem justified and since product imports are unnecessary, it seems logical that imports of products should be prohibited.

Paragraph (h): Under the present program, there are several categories of shipments of petroleum into the United States which do not technically qualify as "imports." All physical shipments into the United States should be included within the import program in order to avoid circumvention of the objectives of the program. I have, therefore, included provisions in my bill covering the following:

First, shipments from Puerto Rico into the United States. At present, there are approximately 30,000 barrels daily of oil products being shipped into the United States and there is a proposal now pending before the Government which would approximately double this rate.

Second, shipments of foreign oil into the United States by the Department of Defense for use outside the United States. Jet fuel and aviation gasoline are in ample supply within the United States and



there is no justification for the Department of Defense to import oil into the United States for use offshore. It is my understanding that this is not currently being done, at least to any substantial extent, but such shipments could be made. This constitutes a loophole in the program which should be closed.

Third, under the Foreign Trade Zones Act, shipments of petroleum or any other commodity into a foreign trade zone located within the United States are not, technically, an "import," and, therefore, such shipments are not covered by the present import program. There is now pending before the Foreign Trade Zones Board a proposal to ship petroleum products into a trade zone to be located within the United States, which products will be utilized as feedstock for a petrochemical plant. If this proposal is approved, other petrochemical companies have indicated they will seek similar treatment. If this is permitted, the domestic industry will lose a substantial market which it now enjoys in providing feedstocks to chemical plants within the United States.

Fourth, shipments of petroleum products, other than residual fuel oil, into the United States which are entered in bond and later withdrawn for commercial use in aircraft or surface vessels engaged in foreign trade. Recently such shipments of jet fuel have increased substantially. This is a market outlet which historically has been supplied by the domestic industry, and unless this loophole is closed, this market will be lost to the domestic industry.

Paragraph (1): The Department of Defense now purchases for worldwide use more than 600,000 barrels daily of light petroleum products. Of these total purchases, more than 200,000 barrels daily or about 35 percent are purchased from foreign sources. The portion of total purchases obtained abroad has increased substantially in recent years. For example in 1954, only 13 percent of total purchases were from foreign sources. While the domestic industry is in depressed condition and there is a large shut-in capacity within the United States, there is no justification for the Department of Defense to purchase 35 percent of its requirements for light products from foreign sources. It seems to me to be extremely unwise for the military to be dependent upon foreign sources for 35 percent of its petroleum supplies.

I, therefore, propose that such foreign purchases of light products be limited to 15 percent of requirements. This would permit the Department of Defense to continue to purchase some 100,000 barrels daily from foreign sources. It would require the Department to divert some 100,000 barrels daily of purchases now being made abroad, to domestic sources. In addition, this provision provides that the approximately 100,000 barrels daily which the Department will be permitted to continue to purchase abroad shall be treated as imports into the United States.

In other words, total imports permitted into the United States would be reduced by the amount of foreign purchases. The purpose of this provision is to enable

the domestic industry to maintain itself in a position to supply the Defense Department in the event that supplies purchased from foreign sources are disrupted.

In summation, the bill I have introduced would result in a substantial increase in the demand for domestic oil. Under this proposal, imports would be reduced in the neighborhood of 375,000 barrels daily. In addition, the Department of Defense would be required to divert some 100,000 barrels daily now purchased abroad to domestic sources. In total, therefore, domestic producers would enjoy an increase in domestic production of almost 500,000 barrels daily or an increase in total production of about 5 percent.

Such an increase in domestic production of oil would give the industry a meaningful economic boost. It would encourage the domestic industry to reverse the declining trends of the past decade which threaten our security as to oil. At the same time, such a reduction in imports would not seriously harm any of the importing countries. The large importing countries have enjoyed very substantial growth during the past 10 years as compared with the United States. A comparison of the production of crude oil in 1964 with 1956 shows the following: Middle East up 127 percent; Canada up 64 percent; Venezuela up 38 percent; United States up 7 percent. Under my proposal the importing countries would continue to enjoy substantial growth.

Mr. Speaker, the proper limitation of imports of oil into the United States is a matter of extreme importance to the 33 oil-producing States such as my State of Texas. The petroleum industry is a keystone to the fiscal position of the oil-producing States and to the economy of the local communities throughout the oil-producing areas of the United States. I am firmly convinced, however, that this matter is beyond the interest of the oil-producing States and that it is a subject that should have the attention of the Members of the House from the consuming States as well. Petroleum has become a necessity to our peacetime economy. It is indispensable to our military defense. For these reasons, I invite and urge my colleagues from every State to give this matter their attention because in my judgment the matter warrants your interest and careful consideration.

#### FREEDOM ACADEMY AND FREEDOM COMMISSION

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to establish a Freedom Academy and a Freedom Commission for the purpose of conducting research into the methods and means of meeting the threats of communism all over the world, to educate and train se-

lective private citizens, as well as governmental personnel, as to how to win the cold war and to provide leadership in encouraging and assisting our universities and other institutions to more effectively contribute to the conflict.

The Freedom Academy and the Freedom Commission are not products of my original thinking. They are not even ideas of recent origin. Their origin dates back to 1950 and lies with a group of dedicated Americans headed by Alan G. Grant, Jr., of Orlando, Fla. This bill is not new to the Congress. As a matter of fact, a similar bill was passed by the Senate late in the 1960 session and later died through inaction in the House. Bills were introduced last session by the gentleman from Louisiana, Congressman HALE BOGGS and others, on which extended hearings were held by the House Un-American Activities Committee. As a result of those hearings I am today joining in the introduction and intend to press for immediate and decisive action by the House.

Let us face the problem squarely. We have already delayed too long. The Communists have systematically prepared themselves to wage thousand-pronged aggression in the nonmilitary area all over the world. In many areas they have moved ahead because we do not know or do not have the means to oppose them. I am firmly convinced that this measure will improve our capability in the nonmilitary area. A Gallup poll some years ago showed that five out of six Americans favored the idea.

I hope that the Members will have an early opportunity to pass on this measure so overwhelmingly favored by their constituents.

#### CONGRESS CAN AID EDUCATION WITHOUT NATIONALIZATION

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which would provide for the return to each State at the end of each fiscal year 5 percent of the Federal income tax collected from that State to be used for public education. This is the simplest, the fairest, and the most expeditious way to aid education.

This bill would make it possible for the States and the local communities to continue their fantastic progress in the field of education. There would be no additional bureaucracy; there would be no threat of nationalization or Federal control. This is the quickest way to help education. No studies, no comprehensive plans, and no long drawn out hearings would be necessary.

In high-level discussions on education here in Washington and in the many national educational conferences held and even in the committees of Congress, there has been little acknowledgment of the magnificent job that has been and is being done by local communities



throughout the Nation. Parents, school trustees, taxpayers, teachers, and professional educators have built the greatest public school system in the world. They have moved forward to meet the challenges of the cold war and the age of astronautics.

Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing today is a vote of confidence in these local instrumentalities of education. This bill will complement them and give them the means to further expand to meet the challenges of the year 2000. Any Federal control of education or any Federal revenue allotted on the basis of conformity or curriculum would be a step backward. We must never lead our people to believe that the problem of education can be solved in Washington. To educate our people to look to Washington rather than themselves would be turning the wheels of progress backward.

The greatest single need of education in my own area is the need for higher teachers' salaries. I believe this to be true of all areas needing assistance in education. We must permit our teachers to compete with their counterparts in industry, in the military, in government, and in other fields of endeavor. Nothing is more important to the future of our country than securing the most qualified and dedicated to teach our children.

Of course, we need expanding facilities, laboratories, and research; but, Mr. Speaker, I repeat, the greatest single need is to secure the best teachers that we can possibly employ. The very best educational program is the only real, sure answer to the problem of poverty, depressed areas, delinquency, and citizenship responsibilities.

Last year, it was my privilege to address high school students and educators all the way from Pennsylvania to Miami, Fla. I spoke to more than 24,000 students in 38 schools, colleges, and educational assemblies. I was tremendously impressed with the magnificent job being done by our teachers, trustees, and professional educators. I was thrilled and elated by the excellent questions propounded by students during discussions and question and answer periods. Education is moving forward. Our teachers and students are looking ahead. The vast majority of them favor this type of approach in aiding education. This bill will not penalize some States to help other States. It will treat all communities and each State fairly. This bill will permit us to build a truly Great Society.

#### WE TREAT OUR MILITARY SHABBILY

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post, on January 16, entitled "We Treat Our Military Shabbily," by a

former Army major, Marion T. Wood, who resigned his commission after 13 years of service as an officer "frustrated and disillusioned."

This is an article that should be read by every Member of the Congress and by every American citizen who is concerned about our national security.

We may develop the most exotic weapons systems in the world; we may build the finest missiles; we may construct fantastic underwater missile launchers; we may lead the world in equipment, but if we do not have men and women provided with a standard of living equivalent to the standard of living they are defending, then one of these days we will awaken to the sad realization that our Armed Forces are sadly deficient in two indispensable ingredients—leadership and motivation.

Former Major Wood has summarized in one article the contents of thousands of letters that I have received over the past few years from members of the armed services and their dependents. We would all do well to heed the warning contained in this penetrating article.

#### WE TREAT OUR MILITARY SHABBILY (By Marion T. Wood)

After 13 years as an officer of the U.S. Army, I recently resigned, frustrated and disillusioned. I was supposed to be guarding something grandly called the American way of life. But, by a cruel paradox, the society I had sworn to protect is a society that is indifferent and even hostile toward me and my comrades.

Built into the very foundation of this Nation is a distrust of soldiers, especially in peacetime. The Declaration of Independence denounces the British for keeping standing armies in the Colonies "in times of peace." The third amendment in the Bill of Rights specifically prohibits the quartering of soldiers in peacetime "in any house without the consent of the owner." In war, the historic pattern has always been the same: When war was declared, the Nation suddenly rallied an Army of civilians, trained and led by professionals who had long endured the persistent apathy and frequent scorn of their country. After the war, the civilians discarded their uniforms and became, as veterans, members of a privileged class. They were rewarded for service after getting out of the Army; those who stayed in were neither rewarded nor even long remembered.

After World War II, the pattern of hostility toward soldiers continued. Typically, the benefits of the GI bill were extended to veterans, but not to those who decided to make the Army (or any other service) a career. Then, however, for the first time in history we found ourselves in a twilight state of neither peace nor war. The cold war suddenly challenged our historic attitude that soldiers were good in wartime and bad in peacetime, and that the best soldier was an ex-soldier.

It was in this twilight that I chose the Army as a profession. Many friends and relatives were stunned. "You must be out of your mind," said one friend. Like so many civilians, they felt that the Army was a place for people who, as it was usually put, "could not do well on the outside." As a matter of fact, I had been doing well on the outside, which in my case was a small college. Membership in the Reserve Officers Training Corps—ROTC—was required for the first 2 years. I enjoyed the experience enough to continue it during my last 2 years in college. My scholastic record was high enough to qualify me for a Regular

Army commission at graduation. As a new infantry lieutenant in June 1950, I fully intended to make the Army my career.

As I look back I still see patriotism as the basic reason I decided to become an Army officer. I have not been able to find a more sophisticated explanation. Soldiers are generally embarrassed when they try to explain what it means to be a soldier. Phrases such as "service to your Nation" and "guardians of democracy" stick in a soldier's throat, as well they should. Good soldiers are soldiers because soldiering is a very real, very meaningful profession. This is especially true in a society where many men with high-paying jobs make no contribution to society. Soldiers, at least, have the satisfaction of knowing their nation needs them. Yet from that nation, soldiers often receive shabby treatment.

My introduction to how the Army treats its own came when the Army took 6 weeks to transform me from a college boy to a rifle-platoon leader, responsible for the lives of some 40 men. Six weeks is not much time. Then I was shipped to Japan, where the Army was frantically putting together outfits to send to Korea. Some consisted mainly of stockade soldiers—men taken from military jails—and untrained South Koreans. I landed in Wonsan, North Korea, in November 1950, without winter clothing.

Our equipment was often shoddy or in short supply. Weapons misfired; ammunition was scarce. There were not enough magazines for our automatic rifles. We were on the line 8 out of 9 months. There were few formal battles or engagements. It was a dirty little war, and the worst part of it was the feeling that no one really cared.

When I got back in the States in 1951, after my tour in Korea, I suddenly was a peacetime soldier. I had been warned that a soldier was a second-class citizen in many Army towns, the communities that live off the payrolls of military bases. The principal industry in most of these towns was taking soldiers for every dime they had.

In many Army towns the citizen most discriminated against is the soldier. Some policemen arrest them with flagrant entrapment techniques. I have seen police wait for a soldier to walk out of a tavern and enter his car. As he pulled away, he was stopped and arrested for driving while intoxicated. Instead of protesting such injustice, the Army condoned it. Man after man was hauled before civilian authorities on such charges, convicted, and fined. Then these men were usually turned over to the Army, which fined them for conduct unbecoming a soldier or an officer. The usual fine in one Army town a few years ago for an officer was \$151.50, and a similar fine was paid to the Army. At one post where I served soldiers were told officially that they should let their wives drive, for a wife could be fined only once—as a civilian.

When I was on my fourth tour of duty at Fort Benning, in 1956, about 9,000 families were living off post. Many families lived in slums. Some used outdoor privies. Others shared bathrooms and kitchens, and slept in shifts because there were not enough bedrooms to go around. Finally, the Government authorized the Army to build 4,000 homes. But members of an area real estate board complained to Washington that the building of so many homes would ruin the local housing market. The authorization was cut down to 1,000 homes. The Army consistently caves in when challenged by local political-pressure groups.

Most civilians think that a soldier's pay is tax-free, that he is financially coddled with extras that more than make up for his low pay. Soldiers do pay Federal income taxes and social security, regardless of where they are stationed in the world. They pay a 3-percent tax on food in all military commissaries. They also pay sales taxes where



there are such taxes. The post exchange is highly overrated as a place for bargains. In many cases a soldier can buy goods cheaper at an off-post discount store. PX prices are deliberately pegged high enough to prevent area civilian merchants from suffering.

On-post Government housing is not free, and it certainly is not cheap. For example, at my last post, in a Government-owned housing project, I paid \$145.05 a month for a small two-bedroom apartment. My next-door neighbor paid \$175 a month for an identical apartment because he happened to be a colonel; I was a major.

Financially, the professional soldier is a second-class Federal employee. Until the cynically timed election-year pay raise recently voted by Congress, the pay of second lieutenants with less than 2 years' service had not been raised since 1958. The starting salary for a married second lieutenant, including all benefits, was about \$4,500 a year. The average, new, Government civilian employee starts at \$5,400. The civilian works a 40-hour week and is eligible for overtime pay. The soldier puts in a workweek of 50 or more hours; even a 65-hour workweek is not unusual. Of course, there is no overtime.

I am not suggesting that soldiering should be a 9-to-5 job with weekends and holidays off. A soldier is a soldier. It is a tough, demanding profession, and it has to be that way. As noncivilians, soldiers do not have many civilian rights. No civilian can be arrested for refusing to show up in his office or factory on a day he does not feel like working. A soldier can be court-martialed. The Army, rightfully, insists on extraordinary power over its men. The Army's mission is to defend the Nation, and to carry out this mission the rights of the Army must transcend the rights of the individual. No good soldier disputes this. And, in giving up rights guaranteed to all other U.S. citizens, no soldier expects extra privileges. This is in keeping with a fine American tradition that contrasts sharply with that of more militaristic nations.

America's long and unbroken tradition as a nonmilitaristic nation is not being questioned by the military men who serve this Nation. They do not want more recognition or more power. They simply want a more equitable share of that American way of life they hear so much about. Their demand is not merely for better pay and benefits; they are asking for a realistic attitude toward the military.

From the military man's point of view, the society he guards is unable to make up its mind. The American society demands a first-class Military Establishment. Yet, by keeping military pay scales low, by seemingly equating a military career with low-status employment, this same society makes it difficult for dedicated men to enter, and stay in, military service.

Rather than a savior of his country, the American fighting man is looked upon as a parasite of an affluent, peacetime society. From Congressmen on down, Americans have refused to look realistically at what brush-fire wars like Vietnam mean to the soldier who has to fight, and perhaps die, in them. The soldier is willing to fight and die, but he has a right to ask that he be treated as a first-class citizen.

It is nothing less than immoral for the American public, through its political and military leaders, to perpetuate a policy of deception and distrust toward the serviceman. Today's victim of this policy is lured into a military career by appeals to his patriotism—and promises of security that are callously broken. I resigned from the Army because I sought a new and more satisfying way of life. I wanted security for myself and my family. I found little of the security the

Army had led me to expect. The Army told me, in a pamphlet promoting the Army as a career, that the Army was striving to stabilize duty assignments, improve family stability, increase career attractiveness. The pamphlet emphasized what was supposed to be a basic Army policy: "The normal tour of duty will be for 3 years." In 13 years I moved 33 times, including 10 times in 9 years of marriage. And my experience was typical; I was a victim of the system.

The supreme irony comes when a man, with sorrow and reluctance, finally decides to resign from the Army. The same civilians who thought him foolish for joining the Army now look on him as foolish for resigning. They eye his rows of ribbons; they see a man of experience and valor withdrawing from their defense. They seem to sense that his absence is a chink in their armor. Perhaps they feel less secure.

In the year ending last June 30, a total of 1,483 regular officers resigned from all the armed services. The total was 1,622 in 1962 and 787 in 1961. The Nation cannot afford to lose these dedicated men. Nor can the Nation continue to believe it is possible to maintain a large Military Establishment whose members merely subsist on the fringes of the society they protect. Thousands of the men who guard America are raising families on incomes at or below the Government's own definition of a "poverty income."

If American civilians want the security provided by a large Military Establishment, they must provide more security to the men in that establishment. These men are not hired gunslingers; most of them are husbands and fathers with families to support. These men would die for their Nation, and these families would mourn them with pride. These Americans are among our finest. And our finest should be nothing less than cherished.

When I decided to resign from the Army, I wrote a letter to myself to justify my decision. I want the opportunity, I wrote, to grow personally and financially, according to my own ability; I want to be part of a stable community; I want a home; but mostly I want my children to grow up in an atmosphere which will more adequately prepare them to face the future with confidence. The U.S. Army does not offer these possibilities to me.

Now that I am a civilian, and proud of my military service and the U.S. Army, perhaps I should change that last sentence. For I know now that the Army was not alone in letting me down. America did, too.

#### GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE IN HOUSE WOULD IMPROVE THE ETHICAL STANDARDS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, from the beginning of time, where man has devised a system of government, human failure of character has been a limiting factor on the achievement of the good that was planned. The pages of history are littered with the ugly scars of those who forgot that public confidence feeds on the honesty of the men who administer the government, whatever its form.

This Nation has made substantial progress in rooting out corruption from government, but the days when everyone

accepted the motto, "To the victors go the spoils," are not far behind.

The matter of ethics in government has always been of deep concern to me, and since my election to Congress in 1948 I have consistently worked with others to raise existing standards, introducing remedial legislation in every Congress since the 82d.

In 1958 with others I was successful in securing adoption of the Code of Ethics for Government Service. This code, as you know, applied not only to employees of the executive and judicial branches of Government, but to the legislative as well and to all Members of the House and Senate.

Since the passage of the Code of Ethics I have continued to push for the creation of a Commission on Ethics in the Federal Service to interpret and implement the Code of Ethics—House Joint Resolution 36, 89th Congress. This Commission would investigate complaints of unethical conduct in Government service and recommend modifications and improvements in statutes relating to ethics.

Another proposal I have introduced is one calling for the creation of a grievance committee for the House—House Resolution 18—to study complaints concerning the conduct of Members of the House of Representatives and to make investigations and appropriate recommendations.

Last year I appeared before the Senate Rules Committee investigating the conduct of employees of the Senate and presented my idea of the grievance committee. The Senate, by a vote of 50 to 33, established a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct to receive complaints and investigate allegations of improper conduct of Senate Members and employees. I understand the leadership of the Senate will soon name the members of the committee and it will begin functioning immediately thereafter.

My bill, House Resolution 18, would add "teeth" to the Code of Ethics and would allow recommendations to correct unethical conduct, including expulsion, censure, impeachment and criminal prosecution. The committee would also be authorized to require any Member of the House to make a full and complete disclosure to the committee of his personal income and investments. Several Members of Congress, including myself, have filed with the Clerk of the House our personal income and investments to comply with this section of my bill.

The grievance committee would be appointed by the Speaker of the House and it would be analogous to procedures in the legal profession and would conduct any investigations of complaints and make recommendations.

I have respectfully requested the Rules Committee to have early hearings on this measure, which I believe is realistic and needed in this juncture in our history.

#### SURPLUS PROPERTY FOR EDUCATIONAL USE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD in explanation of a bill I have introduced.



The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the forward-looking provisions of our laws relating to the administration of Federal property is found in the procedure by which surplus Federal property is made available free or at reduced cost to educational institutions. A great deal of surplus property is generated by the operation of the Federal Government; it is important that we put this property to the best possible use and the program which I have mentioned is one phase of the effort to assure that this goal will be met.

This idea and this program, as I have noted, are sound, but, like any program, improvements can be made in it. I have today introduced a bill which I believe will improve it. This bill broadens the scope of the definition of education so that this surplus property can be used in ways which are not presently permitted for it.

Specifically, the qualifications for receipt of this property under the heading of educational uses are extended to include those situations in which an educational institution for the physically or mentally handicapped provides activities for its students to experience and learn to participate in outdoor activities. Surely, teaching a blind child how better to make his way in the outdoors is a part of his education, a part of bringing him closer to leading a normal and productive life which, I believe, must be the basis for all of our efforts in the education and training of the handicapped.

This proposal came about from contact I had with an educational institution in my district which does an excellent job in helping the handicapped. I am sure it is not the only such institution whose program might be strengthened by the bill which I have offered. I would urge consideration of this bill which is both consistent with the theory behind our surplus property disposal priority system and highly beneficial to the fuller education of our handicapped children.

#### A BILL TO REPEAL THE EXCISE TAX ON BUSINESS MACHINES

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD in explanation of a bill I have introduced.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, last session the Ways and Means Committee held hearings on the whole scope of the excise taxes. At that time we heard representatives from the business machines industry who informed us how that industry and particularly the consumers of that industry are affected by the excise tax on business machines. After doing some research on this subject I introduced a bill to repeal those excise taxes on business machines last session, and I am reintroducing it now.

The present 10 percent manufacturers excise tax on business machines was enacted in 1941 as an emergency World War II defense measure. Its sole purpose was to discourage civilian consumption, thereby conserving critical materials, and to devote the skills of the business machine industry to the war effort. The enactment of this provision was opposed not only by the business machine industry but also by the Treasury Department and was passed by Congress primarily on the basis of a strong request by the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply, whose concern at that time was the curtailing of civilian consumption. It was never considered by any party as permanent legislation appropriate to the peacetime economy.

Basically there are five points to be considered in developing a case against the excise tax on business machines:

First, the tax is contrary to the clear intention of Congress to encourage capital investment. Business machines are virtually 100 percent capital goods items essential to the operation of the modern office. Thus any tax on them would be opposed to the present economic policy of encouraging and stimulating investment in capital goods, as illustrated by the 1962 Revenue Act which was designed with this end in mind. Under the provisions of that act, a 7-percent income tax credit against the purchase of such capital goods was provided. Under the terms of the 1964 Revenue Act, the 7-percent tax credit provision of the law was amended so as to increase even further the incentive for capital investment. As a corollary to the congressional action the Treasury has issued new and more favorable depreciation guidelines on capital goods. Business equipment was specifically listed in these new regulations. But despite these encouragements from the Congress and the Treasury, their effect has been largely nullified by this discriminatory excise tax leveled directly at these items.

The tax on these machines does not primarily victimize the manufacturers of these products. It is passed on to the customer—the purchaser of the machine—and then ultimately the consumers of goods and services who pay the price of this tax.

Second, Mr. Speaker, this tax is a tax on the cost of doing business and is added to the cost of nearly every product and service. Unlike most other types of capital goods, business machines are used in some form or other in virtually every service industry, as well as every level of distribution in all manufacturing and processing industries. Thus the burden of the tax is passed on and pyramided over the cost of most of the products and services in the country. In many States, it is part of the tax base for sales tax purposes and therefore takes on aspects of double taxation.

Thirdly, the excise tax on these machines is becoming increasingly discriminatory against small business. In the 1941 law, which initiated this tax, there were listed some 43 business machines that were in existence at that time. But this list is completely obsolete and inadequate when one considers the many

new machines and functions that have been developed since that time. These new machines are, of course, untaxed, and properly so because of their relation to industrial efficiency and of the intent of Congress to stimulate capital investment as a means of increasing industry growth, increasing employment, and enhancing the ability of American business to compete in international trade. As business grows larger, the tendency is to utilize the more modern equipment, which is usually untaxed. On the other hand, the small enterprise is generally dependent on the standard equipment—that which existed in 1941 and is taxable under the law.

Fourth, the tax has become exceedingly difficult to administer, and is raising some serious compliance problems. The technological revolution which this country has seen includes the business machine industry. That being the case, the Treasury Department has been forced to make rulings to interpret the statute. Even so, it has been an almost impossible task for those charged with the duty of collecting the revenue to keep pace with the sweeping technological changes that are taking place in that industry. There are numerous examples where the old law, even with new rulings, is inequitable and producing inconsistent results. A machine for coding documents which uses holes in the coding system is taxable as a punchcard machine. Another system which is not dependent upon holes for the code is not taxable. In another example, the duplicating machines are taxable but the new electrostatic machines, which are competitors, are not. The development of the electronic data processing industry alone has created a vast gray area between the taxable and the nontaxable which is not capable of clarification.

Aside from the burden that it places on the Treasury Department for constant and individual rulings, it is also placing an undue burden on the industry and its customers. Until the Treasury Department rules on the taxability aspect, manufacturers must either collect an amount equivalent to the possible excise tax, which is then held in escrow, or else insert a provision in the contract of sale for later payment by the customer should the item later be taxed. The burdens this imposes are obvious. Either the customer's capital is indefinitely tied up in escrow or else the manufacturer has the impractical job of collecting this added payment on equipment previously sold to the customer, often many years prior to the ruling.

Compounding the administrative problem, which I have mentioned, is the marketing characteristic of the business machine industry in which the customers often desire to rent the equipment rather than purchase it. On such leases, the manufacturer must maintain detailed excise tax records on each piece of equipment, setting forth the monthly rental payments, and what part of them are allocated to the payment of the excise tax, and the cumulative excise tax paid, until the tax paid on the rentals equals the tax that would have been paid if the



equipment had been sold. It is interesting to note that it is possible for the user to rent two identical machines—one on which he must pay the excise tax, and not on the other. This inequity arises because it is possible to rent equipment which has been previously rented a sufficient amount of time to pay off the entire excise tax. And it is possible that one user may rent a machine and have to pay the tax while his competitor rents an identical machine and pays none.

The Federal Government is one of the largest renters of business equipment. The Treasury, recognizing the complications that I have outlined above, has exempted the collection of excise tax on equipment rented to the Federal Government but still collects it on equipment sold to the Government. This contradiction discriminates severely in favor of those companies which rent to the Government. Furthermore, such divergent treatment complicates the sound evaluation by Government agencies as to the economic desirability of purchase versus rental of equipment.

Fifth, the tax does not produce substantial net revenue for the Federal Government. The increase of new machines and new functions has had a marked effect on this specific tax as a revenue producing agent for the Treasury. Total revenues from this tax in fiscal 1963 were \$74.8 million, the lowest collection since 1956. This figure reflects a steady decline in collections from a high of \$99 million in 1960. This is due primarily to the increasing proportion of sales of electronic data processing and related equipment. It is expected that 1964 will show an even further erosion of this as a revenue producing measure.

It should be further noted that the gross amount of revenue collected under this excise tax does not represent added income for the Government. Depreciation on the taxed machines is fully deductible for Federal income purposes as a necessary business expense. Therefore, the excise tax itself becomes a deduction which would not otherwise be available and results in lower income tax collections. Moreover, the industry's largest single customer is the Federal Government itself, and all sales to it, which are taxed, do not constitute real revenue, but reflect only a series of such transactions.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons I am today reintroducing a bill to repeal the excise tax on business machines sold after December 31, 1965. My bill also takes into account the lease payments made on these business machines and repeals the tax with respect to payments made after December 31, 1965, for leasing periods after that date.

I have also considered in this bill the matter of floor stock refunds. In the case of some types of business machines—typewriters, for example—dealers will have stocks of taxpaid business machines on hand at the time of termination of the tax. If refunds were not provided, they would presumably have to absorb the tax because the customers would have the ready alternative of buying from some dealer who had purchased the equipment from the manufacturer after the termination of the excise tax.

In view of this, my bill provides that where dealers have a stock of business machines on hand on the effective date of the repeal of the tax and they have paid the tax on those articles, a tax credit or refund may be claimed on those taxes. These refunds or credits are available only in those cases where the manufacturer has reimbursed the dealer for the tax, or has obtained the dealer's consent to the allowance of the credit or refund.

#### PRO RATA DIVISION OF CORPORATIONS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD in explanation of a bill I have introduced.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have today reintroduced an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code to permit the division of a corporation into two corporations on a fully non pro rata basis. It is designed to permit a tax-free transaction for the division of a corporation into two smaller economic units without a pro rata division of ownership in the new corporations. Last session, the bill was numbered H.R. 3061.

At present such a division is possible but section 355, which permits it, requires that the corporation divided be engaged in the active conduct of two separate businesses for the 5 years preceding the distribution. This bill questions the requirement for the conduct of a trade or business for a fully non pro rata distribution.

An explanation of the bill follows:

Subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of paragraph (1) of section 355(c), which the bill would add to the code, are practically self-explanatory and state the mechanical and arithmetical limits of the transactions which will be permitted to occur tax free. The two survivor corporations must be of comparable size and must not have any common shareholders.

Subparagraph (D) provides that 90 percent of the stock of the distributing corporation must have been acquired more than 5 years before the distribution or received as a gift, devise, or bequest from a person who acquired it more than 5 years before the distribution. It should be observed that for purposes of this section a tax-free acquisition of stock is considered an acquisition at the time of the tax-free exchange or distribution, so that the requirement of the subparagraph is not satisfied if stock was acquired in a reorganization or in a section 351 transaction less than 5 years before the distribution.

Subparagraph (E) is intended to prevent stockholders from achieving a taxable exchange or purchase through the use of contributions to capital. Thus, for example, if stockholder A—owning 50 percent of the stock—contributes an apartment house to the corporation while stockholder B—owning 50 percent of the stock—contributes investment securities to the corporation before the distribution, and after the distribution each shareholder owns stock of a corporation which owns the property contributed by the other shareholder, the transaction will not qualify under subsection (c)(1)(E). Such a transaction will be treated as a total liquidation, even if the distributing corporation is not formally liquidated, but retained by one of the shareholders.

Subparagraph (F) is intended to guard against the use of the subsection for tax avoidance purposes. While the courts would probably read this requirement into the statute in any case, a clear statement is believed desirable in view of the fact that the bill brings a new concept into the code.

Proposed section 355(c)(2) makes it clear that section 356 does not apply to any transaction which fails to meet the requirements of subsection (c)(1) because some or all of the shareholders own stock of more than one corporation—directly or constructively by application of section 318—after the transaction. In such a case, the transaction is treated as a partial or total liquidation immediately preceded by a distribution to which section 301 applies. This may be illustrated by a simple example: A and B each own 50 percent in value of the stock of corporation Z. One-half—in value—of the assets of corporation Z are transferred to corporation X and the other one-half—in value—are transferred to corporation Y. Immediately thereafter all of the stock of X and Y is distributed to A and B and Z is liquidated. In the distribution A receives 90 percent of the stock of corporation X and 10 percent of the stock of corporation Y, while B receives 90 percent of the stock of corporation Y and 10 percent of the stock of corporation X. The transaction fails to meet the requirements of subsection (c)(1) and under subsection (c)(2) it is taxed as follows: A is treated as having received a dividend of 10 percent of the stock of corporation Y and B is treated as having received a dividend of 10 percent of the stock of corporation X immediately before the distribution of all the other stock distributed. A is also treated as having received 90 percent of the stock of corporation X in a total liquidation and B is similarly treated as having received 90 percent of the stock of corporation Y in a total liquidation.

It should be observed that the Commissioner's authority under existing section 312(i) to allocate earnings in section 355 transactions will, of course, extend to transactions permitted by the new subsection which the bill will add to section 355.

#### HEALTH CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, the No. 1 issue before this 89th Congress and the Nation is health care for the aged.

There is no question but that this is a national problem which must be resolved. Our senior citizens need help to meet their medical costs. Modern medical miracles have greatly added to the span of life in our society. Now all of us can look forward to many more of the golden years of life. But this great blessing has also brought with it sharply increased medical expenses. Periods of illness are much longer and the costs of hospital, doctors, nurses, and drugs have skyrocketed.

Millions of our senior citizens are fully able to care for their ordinary expenses of living, but are in constant fear of a major sickness which they cannot pay for.



This is a national problem which this Congress must resolve. This Nation has an obligation here—to provide decent medical care to its senior citizens in their declining years. We are a prosperous Nation with great resources of wealth. We can well afford to provide medical care to those of our citizens who have contributed so much in their working and productive lives to our Nation's wealth.

The real question before this Congress is not whether we shall do this, but how shall we do it.

We have two paths down which to travel. We can go down the Government road, of creating a whole new Federal bureaucracy to handle this problem, with countless new rules and regulations, tons of paperwork, and countless new thousands of bureaucrats. We can have socialized medicine. This is what this administration wants to cram down our throats.

By taking this path, we will hamstring our hospitals and doctors. We can well place in jeopardy far and away the best overall medical care that any nation in the world enjoys.

Proponents of socialized medicine keep telling us about how well it has worked in European countries. I believe the facts are otherwise. At any rate, it cannot be denied that private enterprise here in this Nation has produced the world's best health care.

Or, we can take another path—that of private enterprise. Let Uncle Sam finance this needed health care for our senior citizens, but let our Nation's health care problems be handled in the same fine manner that exists today. This is the path I will follow. This is the American way.

I am introducing today a bill, modeled after the medical care bill first introduced by the gentleman from Ohio, Representative FRANK BOW.

My bill provides for comprehensive medical care for our senior citizens over 65 through private enterprise, using the facilities of health insurance carriers.

The bill provides for insurance paying for hospital costs up to 90 days, convalescent home care up to 30 days and surgery, doctors calls, and ancillary charges.

The cost of the health insurance plans would be paid out of general revenues of the Government. The method would be by permitting the individual senior citizen to deduct the cost of the health insurance up to \$150 from his annual income tax due Uncle Sam, or in those cases where he paid no tax, then Uncle Sam would pay for the insurance.

The health insurance would be available to single citizens over 65 with incomes less than \$4,000, and to married citizens over 65 with incomes less than \$8,000. Thus, it would be geared to need.

Why is my bill better than the administration bill, H.R. 1, which is essentially the same highly controversial, King-Anderson bill of other years? There are many reasons. Of first and greatest importance, my bill provides greater medical coverage. It not only covers basic hospital room costs, but also doctors' calls, surgery charges, drugs, and

miscellaneous hospital charges. It helps our senior citizens far better than the administration bill.

It employs the same methods now used in this Nation for health care. There are almost countless millions of health insurance plans in force in this Nation. Our citizens, hospitals, and doctors are all familiar with these methods. Why impose unnecessary new Government rules and regulations under a new system of socialized medicine?

My bill, while covering nearly 15 million people, is confined to those people who need the coverage. Why pay for the medical costs of our citizens who can well afford to pay their own bills?

Under the administration bill, our already hard-pressed workers would be paying for the health care of millionaires.

Best of all reasons for my bill, is that the cost is paid out of the general revenues of the Government. In other words, every taxpayer shares the cost, the wealthy as well as our wage earners, and the big powerful corporations, too, in accordance with their ability to pay.

Under the administration bill the cost is placed upon the worker with an added social security deduction from his paycheck. And believe me, the first deduction will be the beginning only, it will go up and up in later years just as the social security deductions have gone up.

Most of all, my bill keeps the Government out of medicine. My bill rejects socialized medicine as have the vast majority of thinking citizens over the years. My bill follows the same system of private enterprise, health insurance plans which have proven so phenomenally successful in this Nation.

We have a superb medical care system in this Nation. Let us not tamper with it by experimenting with socialized medicine.

We have seen how, in some nations, it has laid the heavy hand of bureaucracy on medical care and hurt it.

Let us simply expand our present system of private health insurance that has worked so well.

Let us reject out of hand this un-American socialized medicine scheme of the administration.

Let us not overburden our workers by new cuts out of their paychecks.

Let us care for our senior citizens adequately, with a good bill, such as the one I have just introduced.

#### THE NATIONAL COPPER STOCKPILE

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation to authorize the temporary release of 100,000 short tons of copper from the national stockpile. The need for this measure extends far beyond the bounds of my congressional district; it is of importance to our entire national economy.

Our domestic copper fabricators and the myriad of industrial users of copper supplies are in a most difficult position through no fault of their own. I am not attempting to simplify a complex problem, but in, brief, lengthy labor disputes—disputes which have now been resolved—are the key to the existing crisis. Copper is now in short supply and, although prospects for the future are brighter, immediate action must be taken to help alleviate the present situation.

The seriousness of the current predicament is immediately evident when one realizes that in my district steady employment prospects for more than 4,000 workers are jeopardized by the existing copper crisis. On a national scale, many, many times that number of workers stand to be adversely affected by this situation unless we here in the Congress take appropriate action.

At a time when all of us here on Capitol Hill are exploring new programs designed to create more jobs, let us not miss this opportunity to preserve existing jobs.

The bill that I am introducing would give authority to the Office of Emergency Planning to release, on a loan basis, 100,000 short tons of copper from the national stockpile to domestic copper producers. The rules and regulations governing the release of the copper would be prescribed by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning; however, I want to stress that there should be an equitable distribution that is fair to large and small producer alike.

At present, the Federal Government has more than 1 million short tons of copper in the national stockpile. Under Public Law 520, the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning is authorized and directed to determine from time to time what materials are strategic and critical as well as the quality and quantity of such materials which shall be stockpiled.

I fully recognize the need for this activity and am well aware that copper is a strategic material. For this reason, the bill that I am introducing calls for a short-term loan rather than an outright sale of copper.

One of the major terms of this measure is that any producer receiving copper under the proposed plan shall agree to restore to the national stockpile an amount and grade of copper at least equivalent to that received, first, not later than 1 year after the receipt thereof, or second in the event of an emergency, as determined by the President, not later than 60 days after notice thereof.

Favorable action on this bill will demonstrate our sincere interest in coming to grips with a serious problem and solving it without in any way endangering our national security objectives or expending vast sums of money. Clearly, the Federal Government has an opportunity, in fact an obligation, to help preserve jobs and strengthen our economy. I believe passage of this bill will do just that.



### THE SERIOUS FARM LABOR PROBLEM IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, all of us have read and know about the disaster that has struck northern California in the form of floods. An equally disastrous tragedy has struck southern California. Due to our inability to harvest our agricultural crops because of the expiration of the bracero program, there are hundreds of thousands in dollar value and soon there will be millions in dollar value of agricultural crops in southern California going unharvested. This has already resulted in the shutting down of one packinghouse, the moving of some agricultural production to Mexico, and the loss of thousands, tens of thousands, and it will soon be hundreds of thousands of jobs for domestic workers in packinghouses, driving trucks, and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully call the attention of the Members to an article which appeared in one of the newspapers in my district in the last few days which accurately depicts this whole tragic story.

The article referred to is as follows:

#### LABOR LACK CLOSES ONE PACKINGHOUSE (By Murray Norris)

One citrus packinghouse has closed in Ventura County and most of the remainder are receiving only a fraction of the fruit needed, due to the farm labor shortage.

The good demand for lemons coupled with low supplies in Ventura County sheds is extremely frustrating to many packinghouse managers. They can see the fruit on the trees, they have a market to sell them at good prices, but they can't get them off the trees.

Because they are unable to harvest the citrus crop, some growers and packers are becoming worried about the 3 million boxes of export citrus which Ventura County was able to sell last year. The higher costs of production could easily price local citrus producers out of the export market. A short supply of harvested fruit would keep most of the citrus on the domestic market.

"Right now, I doubt that you could get a box of export fruit in Ventura County—our supplies are too low," said Carl McKnight at the Saticoy Lemon Association Packinghouse.

#### CLOSES PACKINGHOUSE

T. A. Lombard, manager of Rancho Sespe outside of Fillmore, said he has closed his citrus packinghouse because of the high costs of production.

"Our costs of picking increased 60 percent as soon as the braceros left," said Lombard. "If this continues, we will be out of the lemon business in a very short time."

He didn't think that higher prices for produce or citrus was the answer to the higher production costs. If Americans raise their prices, the foreign producers will flood the country with their farm products.

#### IMPORTS

"Italians are already shipping lemon juice into this country way below what we can produce it for," he said. "If we raise our prices they'll only pour in lots more."

Last year, some 20 percent of the State's lemon crop, and between 15 and 17 percent

of the Valencia orange crop was exported to Europe. In Ventura County, 25 percent of the lemon crop was exported.

This year, there may be no exports unless the citrus crop can be harvested.

"It all depends on what fraction of your crop you can harvest," said Bill Craig, manager of Limoniera Ranch at Santa Paula. "If you can only get half of your crop off the trees, you will sell it as domestic fresh. Export is the market for a surplus. If you can't get your harvest in you won't have any surplus."

At Limoniera, all types of workers have been turned out into the fields to pick citrus.

#### EVERYONE PICKS

"We have a number of men who are multiple-occupation workers who are available for picking," said Craig. These men work all year at the ranch and live in ranch housing. They have been taken off other jobs to keep the fruit flowing into the ranch packinghouse.

"We have about 20 percent of the men we need at the peak," said Craig. "As soon as the weather dries off and more fruit comes on, we will be in a pickle."

However, Limoniera is apparently lucky compared with other packinghouses that are receiving only one-sixth of the fruit they need and want.

Jess Phillips, manager of a local packinghouse said his crews were picking only 500 boxes a day when the packinghouse could use 3,000.

#### ONLY 200 BOXES

Riley Besand, plant manager for Ventura Coastal Lemon at Montalvo, said he was getting between 15 and 20 percent of the fruit needed. He wants 1,500 boxes a day; he is getting 200.

Both Phillips and Besand said their packinghouse women were working only a few hours a week and were drawing partial unemployment insurance. Like other county packinghouses, these two are using this slack period to catch up on maintenance. Within a week or two, or three at the most, all maintenance will be finished.

"Then they [the men] will either go into the fields and pick, or be laid off," said Besand. He wasn't sure what to do with the women.

One plant manager predicted: "We will all be out there with bags by the end of the month, if something doesn't improve."

While a Los Angeles group of Mexican-Americans was asking for a congressional investigation into the "passing over" of farm skills of that ethnic group, local farmers were high in their praise of the abilities of the Mexican-Americans who work the county farms.

#### PASSED OVER

Both farmers and State employment officials insisted that no Mexican-American had been passed over in this area.

"I don't think there has been even a whisper of anything like that," said Francis Bowden, manager of the Ventura office of the State department of employment. "I'm sure that every Mexican-American knows we are actively working to do everything we can."

This was reaffirmed by the State farm labor office at Oxnard where a spokesman said: "No one has been turned away who was able to do the work and willing to do the work." He said his office was referring more laborers than ever before and everyone was "doing the same as we always have."

#### MORE WORKERS

Because of the rains up north and the rains in Ventura County, the demand for farm labor is the closest to being filled by domestic workers that it will ever be, say both farmers and State officials.

Bill Tolbert of the Ventura County Citrus Growers Committee said that his group of

farmers have used as high as 2,500 workers at this time of the year. However, because of the rain, they only need 1,000 this year. They had 554 working in the fields yesterday, 21 of whom quit.

A spokesman for the State farm labor placement office in Oxnard said the oranges were coming on late this year and this was making the demand for workers far below normal. Many of the farmworkers now asking for jobs in Ventura County will be migrating north in April just when the labor demand will be increasing here.

Tolbert said he has started the navel orange harvest in the Piru area this week, and he hoped to have enough workers next week to send some pickers into the orange groves in the Ojai area.

He said he was promised two busloads (76 men) from Los Angeles on Wednesday. His buses brought back only 20 workers. He needs at least 450 more pickers immediately.

Lemon men were concerned over both the rain and the labor shortage. The rain is making the lemons grow too rapidly, and the lack of labor may make it impossible to harvest them before they become oversized. There is little market for oversized fruit.

### REVIEW OF THE SORDID DETAILS OF THE BOBBY BAKER SCANDALS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the splendid article in yesterday's Washington Star in which the Star's staff writers, Paul Hope and John Barron, review the sordid details of the Bobby Baker scandals and propound 15 important questions the answers for which the Senate Rules Committee ought to have sought months ago.

No single newspaper in this country and no two reporters have done more than the Washington Star and Mr. Hope and Mr. Barron to try to keep this rotten, immoral mess from being swept under the most convenient rug.

I suggest that for its valiant efforts to root out and fix responsibility for the evils implicit in these scandals, efforts that have met with obstacles at almost every turn, the Washington Star and its staff writers be nominated for the next award of the Pulitzer Prize.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to make such an unofficial nomination.

### MINORITY EMPLOYEES

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 96 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That pursuant to the Legislative Pay Act of 1929, as amended, five of the minority employees authorized therein shall be the following-named persons, effective January 4, 1965, until otherwise ordered by the House, to wit: Harry L. Brookshire and William B. Prendergast to receive gross compensation of \$23,059.64 per annum, respectively; William R. Bonsell to receive gross compensation of \$18,741.89 per annum; Tommy Lee Winebrenner, to receive gross compensation of \$16,214.50 per annum; and



Walter Patrick Kennedy (minority pair clerk), to receive gross compensation of \$18,270.00 per annum.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT IN THE MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ANDREWS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, last November, Chairman WAYNE N. ASPINALL of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, one of the acknowledged leaders in the field of conservation and reclamation, delivered an excellent speech before the annual joint convention of the North Dakota Water Users Association and the North Dakota Water Management District Association, in Bismarck, N. Dak. Chairman ASPINALL discussed legislative responsibility in connection with water resources development in the Missouri River Basin and elsewhere throughout the West. I believe that his discussion of past problems in connection with the Federal reclamation program and his appraisal of future actions that are needed will be of interest to every Member of this body. I am, therefore, including Chairman ASPINALL's address as a part of these remarks.

Commissioner Floyd Dominy also delivered an excellent speech to the convention which I am including for the information of my colleagues:

REMARKS OF HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL BEFORE THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NORTH DAKOTA WATER USERS ASSOCIATION, NOVEMBER 19, 1964, BISMARCK, N. DAK.

I am pleased to have this opportunity to participate in the sixth annual convention of the North Dakota Water Users Association and North Dakota Water Management District Association, Inc., particularly in the company of your outstanding Governor, who has done so much for your State, and who did everything humanly possible earlier this year to obtain favorable action on the Garrison project legislation. I will say more about Garrison a little later, but first I want to leave with you a few thoughts I have relative to water resource development in the Missouri River Basin and the legislative responsibility which those of us in the Congress have for this program.

I have had a direct interest in the development of your water resources much longer than most of you realize. In 1952, I served as a member of President Truman's Missouri Basin Survey Commission along with your own senior Senator MLT YOUNG. As I contemplated what I should talk to you about tonight, I recalled some of the issues and problems relating to water resources development which that Commission considered 12 years ago. I recalled also some of the recommendations of that Commission, which, incidentally, no one paid any attention to. We submitted our report to President Truman on January 12, 1953, and the new administration which took over a week later showed no particular interest in it. How-

ever, I have always considered that it was a worthwhile study and report. The resource principles which that Commission recommended to guide the development in the Missouri Basin are as relevant today as they were 12 years ago—not just for the Missouri Basin but for the entire Nation. They include such items as comprehensive and coordinated planning, proper balance among all phases of resource development, maximum use of resources, local participation to the greatest extent possible, priority of water uses, and economic and financial feasibility. The Commission stated that "the overall purpose of resource development should be to enhance economic opportunity for the people of the basin, improve their welfare and enlarge their contribution to the Nation." Time has not changed that objective.

To implement its recommendation for comprehensive planning, the survey commission recommended that Congress establish a Missouri Basin Commission which would be responsible for directing Federal resource activities in the Missouri Basin and coordinating those activities with resource development activities of the States. Other recommendations of the survey commission related to national policy with respect to land and water resource development and to State and local participation in the Missouri River Basin program. There were also recommendations on economic procedures and practices to be followed in the Missouri River Basin.

I've often wondered what the situation in the Missouri Basin might be today with respect to resource development if the recommendations of the Missouri Basin Survey Commission had been adopted and activated. Take, for instance, the commission proposal. There was some disagreement among the survey commission members as to the type of organization which should be established to direct and coordinate the development of the land and water resources in the basin but there was no disagreement on the need for a central organization of some kind. So far as comprehensive planning is concerned, the proposal to establish a Missouri Basin Commission is very similar to the present proposal embodied in S. 1111, which passed the Senate this year and was approved by my committee. If we had established a Missouri Basin Commission, or a similar central organization 12 years ago and had adopted other recommendations made at that time, I wonder if resource development in the basin would not be in better order today. I say this because, to a great extent, our problems in the Missouri Basin have stemmed from lack of cooperation and coordination as well as inadequate study. To be perfectly frank with you, there has been more inefficiency and waste in the Missouri River Basin than in any other major water development program. The Bureau of Reclamation alone has spent around \$70 million for investigations and planning and they've done no worse than the other Federal agencies. While the Missouri River Basin project was authorized as a single integrated development, and this is as it should be, it did come about as the result of a "shotgun wedding" between the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, and it was authorized without adequate study and information. While some of the project features authorized in 1944 had been investigated in some detail, the majority of them had been given only a quick reconnaissance survey. Had the plan been considered as a framework within which specific projects could be further studied and recommended to the Congress as we have done in other areas it would have been fine, but the plan was not adequate to provide construction authority, as has been proven over the last 20 years.

This was the plan that gave us the third division of the Riverton project, which ap-

parently we are about to abandon after nearly 20 years of trying to make it work. This is also the plan which gave us many additional problems. Some units, such as the Bixby, were abandoned after construction had started. Some of the reservoirs that were constructed primarily to serve irrigation, for one reason or another, have never done so. We built the Tiber Dam at a cost of more than \$20 million primarily to serve irrigation but then we found no sentiment for irrigation development in the area and the irrigation facilities have never been built. Other problem units in the Missouri Basin include Cedar Bluff, Heart Butte, Keyhole, Moorhead, and Shade Hill. Even with this experience I know that there are many in the Basin who are quite unhappy with the policy we adopted last year that no new units of the Missouri River Basin project could be started without reauthorization. However, I believe you can see that this is the only way we can know where we stand on the overall project, both with respect to development and the financial position.

I doubt if many of you realize the extent of the criticism of the entire reclamation program as a result of problems caused by hasty and politically inspired actions, or the burdens placed upon those of us who are responsible for justifying the reclamation program in the Congress. Perhaps a nationwide program that provides "something for everybody" can survive this kind of criticism but, in my opinion, a sectional program such as reclamation can not. I don't believe that in the years ahead, as we face a national water crisis, the Nation can afford inefficiency and waste.

I hope I have not left the impression that I am critical of the physical development we find in the Missouri River Basin today. I certainly am not because it has already contributed immensely to the economy of not only the 10 States of the basin directly affected but to the Nation as a whole. I am only critical of how we got to where we are today and the waste and inefficiency involved. But certainly no one questions the wisdom of the program. The main stem of the Missouri has been harnessed. Some 85 million acre-feet of storage capacity has been provided. Control of main stem flood waters has, for the most part, been achieved and navigation below Sioux City has been greatly enhanced. The Missouri River Basin power system, with a total capacity of about 3 million kilowatts, is contributing greatly to the economy of the entire basin. The entire development is a single entity from a financial standpoint in order that maximum use of basin resources can be accomplished. Thus, as we look at the development already in being, we know that this has been a highly successful venture. However, we must think about the future and the role that reclamation is to play. This integrated development is only partially complete and the water resources are not being fully used. Irrigation development has lagged behind development for the other purposes. To a great extent, the benefits flowing from the project at the present time accrue to downstream interests at the expense of the up-river States. I know that several hundred thousand acres of prime agricultural and wildlife lands in the North Dakota flood plain of the Missouri River are now inundated and removed from use by the main stem control structures. I know that towns and villages have been uprooted and that thousands of Indians had to be relocated. I know that these actions have meant to your State in terms of reduced income and reduced tax base. Up to this time the overall impact of the Missouri River Basin project on your State has probably been negative. The values and benefits to North Dakota from this great basin program will be realized only when we have achieved balanced development which will come about with completion of the reclamation projects including the Garrison unit.



My objective is to get the overall program in the Missouri Basin in order and on the firm foundation necessary to survive critics of today and tomorrow so that the project may be completed as originally envisioned. That is why I sponsored the legislation which, in effect, requires all new units to be authorized or reauthorized by the Congress. This is why, also, I insisted that the Interior Department review the financial aspects of the project and determine what actions were necessary to put the project in a sound financial position. Development of the Missouri River Basin project as a single entity permits the use of power revenues to assist in paying irrigation costs. This is a sound conservation principle to which I thoroughly subscribe and which I have always supported. However, power revenues cannot assist irrigation development when power can't even pay its own way. If we can get the Missouri River Basin power system on a paying basis, the financial assistance needed for irrigation development will cease to be a problem.

It was about a year ago that the Department of the Interior submitted its report and recommendations to the Congress with respect to the financial position of the Missouri River Basin project. Its proposal essentially met our requirement for repayment of all reimbursable costs within a 50-year period. The two major recommendations called for an average increase in firm power rates of a quarter of a mill for kilowatt-hour and the use of a 2½-percent interest rate in amortizing the unpaid power investment in Corps of Engineers projects. The Department has not put the rate increase into effect, pending a decision by the Congress with respect to the interest rate. The interest rate provision was in the Garrison legislation. This provision was acceptable to me and it was acceptable to my committee because it is the same interest rate that is used in repaying the cost of other major Federal power systems in which the Department of the Interior markets power from the Corps of Engineers powerplants. The Bonneville Power Administration system, the Southwestern Power Administration system, and the Southeastern Power Administration system all market power and energy under repayment schedules using the 2½ percent interest rate for past expenditures. However, since the Garrison legislation was not enacted the Department has not been in position to put the rate increase into effect. Thus, the Missouri River Basin project is still not in a sound financial position, and we have this problem to resolve next year.

Those of you who were in Palm Springs last week heard me discuss legislative responsibility in connection with the reclamation program. I do not intend to repeat all that I said there, but I do want to report briefly on how we are trying to meet our responsibility because it has a direct bearing on further development in the Missouri River Basin. The reclamation program, including the Missouri River Basin project, is the responsibility of the Congress. Congress has the responsibility for establishing the policies and guidelines for Federal participation in the development of water resources. We cannot meet this responsibility, however, unless we in the Congress receive the full cooperation of the Executive, including all the agencies having responsibility in the water field, and the full cooperation of the States and others interested in water development. We can be successful in making maximum use of our limited resources only if there is the fullest cooperation and coordination and a willingness to adopt uniform policies and procedures. We must remove agency competition and partisan politics from project consideration and authorize projects on the basis of merit and their ability to meet the needs of the American people. Only by measuring up to these standards can we place rec-

lamation on the sound foundation necessary for continued service in the decades ahead.

Since I have been Chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs we have been attempting to meet this legislative responsibility because I believe it is necessary in the national interest. We have been trying to reverse this every-agency-for-itself trend and to make a start toward establishing general policies and procedures that will provide the cooperative and coordinated national effort in the water field which is essential. Our objective is a national approach to water resources development. It is now clear that all the Nation's water resources must be developed to the fullest extent, whether the water is eventually to be used for agriculture, industry, or for our rapidly growing cities and towns. Planning, therefore, must be on a comprehensive and coordinated basis to provide multiple benefits and Congress must establish the Federal role and the roles of the various water development agencies.

In the 88th Congress we have made considerable progress in the direction of uniform policy. The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, for example, will now provide an urgently needed and rational method of financing an accelerated program for recreation development at water resources projects, as well as help preserve and develop other potential recreation opportunities across the Nation. By authorizing a system of user fees it also establishes a cost-sharing policy for the direct beneficiaries of recreation development at Federal reservoirs—all Federal reservoirs, not just Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs.

The Water Research Act, in addition to bringing to bear the talents of our colleges and universities for resolving numerous water problems to assist our national effort, also provides for full coordination and cooperation among all agencies responsible for water research and for establishing agency responsibilities in water research. I emphasize all Federal agencies, not just agencies in the Department of the Interior.

While the Water Resources Planning Act was not enacted, the fact that it passed the Senate and was approved by my committee indicates congressional recognition that it is needed legislation and I predict that it will be given early consideration in the 89th Congress. This legislation provides the planning guidance for the Nation which all planning agencies—Federal, State, and local—must follow—not just planning agencies of the Department of the Interior.

The Water Project Recreation Act was developed by my committee with the cooperation of the administration. Although it was not enacted it nevertheless provides a policy which my committee is following and which the administration is following in submitting water projects to the Congress. I believe that this legislation will also be considered early in the next Congress and will be enacted. It is urgently needed for establishing cost-sharing policies in connection with recreation and fish and wildlife aspects of all water projects—not just projects of the Department of the Interior or the Bureau of Reclamation. I'm sure you will remember that this legislation resolved one of our major problems in connection with Garrison.

The extension of the Small Reclamation Projects Act was not enacted but we are now in position to go forward with consideration of this legislation on the basis of uniform treatment of recreation in all small local water projects. We now have the administration's recommendations for treating recreation and fish and wildlife alike in small reclamation projects and watershed projects of the Department of Agriculture.

In addition to these specific items, project legislation enacted in the 88th Congress makes it clear that Congress is going to require full repayment of reimbursable costs

of water projects in a 50-year period and that projects must be economically justified and reauthorized if plans become outdated. I have already mentioned this in relationship to the Missouri Basin project.

So you see, considerable progress was made in the 88th Congress toward a national approach to water development and the standardization of policies although our authorization program was below expectations. I was, of course, disappointed that Garrison was not authorized because it was ready and in position and I was further disappointed because of your great effort that now must be repeated. However, I am not greatly concerned merely because the actual dollar amount for projects authorized in the 88th Congress is below the average of our construction program. With some reclamation projects extremely large and others very small, it is not practical to expect the dollar amount of our authorization program to be the same every year or every Congress. For instance, in the 84th Congress, we authorized projects costing more than \$1½ billion and, in the 85th, we authorized projects costing only about \$60 million. With around \$2.5 billion remaining in the going construction program, it is my view that the critical factor for reclamation is the annual level of spending authorized by the appropriations acts. As you know I have appeared before the Appropriations Committee every year recently, urging that the level of appropriations be increased. We were finally able to get the construction program up to about \$300 million in fiscal year 1964, but this year it was reduced for the first time since the 83d Congress. I think the important thing is not that we authorize a lot of projects in any particular year just to make a record but, instead, that we have a sound, progressive and expanding program which is an integral part of our national water resources development task and which meets the needs of the American people.

In my opening remarks I indicated that I had had a direct interest in Missouri River Basin development since 1952. Some of you know that I have also been acquainted with the Garrison project for some time. I was chairman of the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee that came to North Dakota 7 years ago and held the new-famous hearings in Devils Lake. I recall that I was surprised to see the show of interest and the united support for the project at that time. I also recall that, at the close of those hearings, I cautioned you against over-optimism, but I surely didn't anticipate that it would take us this long to get the unit in position to be authorized. We ran into many unexpected problems.

In closing, let me repeat that I am fully aware of what North Dakota has given up in the interest of overall development and in order to bring multiple-purpose benefits to others outside your borders, and that nothing less than full development of the Garrison unit can provide North Dakota with the benefits and values to which it is entitled from the integrated project. No one knows better than I that the Garrison unit cannot be considered alone but only as a part of the overall basin development. Without the Garrison unit and other irrigation projects we would not have a balanced development and the Congress would not have kept faith with North Dakota and the other upriver States.

I share with you the disappointment over the delay in Garrison authorization. However, I believe the end of your long wait is in sight. I feel confident that, when you meet a year from now, the Garrison authorization will be a reality. It had been my hope to authorize the Garrison unit this year. Had there not been unexpected roadblocks which related more to the rush for adjournment and to the fact we were in an



election year than to the merits of the Garrison project we would have been successful. The important thing now is that we are in position to move the Garrison legislation without delay next year. The problems we have had in the past—particularly those relating to cost-sharing policy and to the financial position of the overall Missouri River Basin program—have, I hope, been resolved. As far as I am concerned, the Garrison project will be the first order of business before the Irrigation Subcommittee next year.

REMARKS BY FLOYD E. DOMINY, COMMISSIONER, BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NORTH DAKOTA WATER USERS ASSOCIATION IN BISMARCK, N. DAK., NOVEMBER 20, 1964

It is good to be here and to see again the many friends I have come to know and cherish during our long, mutual efforts to develop the water resources of the State of North Dakota—a development this State so strongly needs and deserves.

Water development struggles, like military campaigns and athletic contests, generate strong and abiding friendships. We all have a feeling that we have been involved in something that we believe in and actively desire to win—even those of us who are actually engaged in a nonbelligerent capacity as planners and consultants.

And from my vantage point, I have been impressed that this organization has always been a powerful driving force in North Dakota water development efforts as well as one of the major organizations which has made possible impressive and continuing progress in the development of our country's resources. Throughout the West, a significant number among your membership are recognized as leaders and men of action who have demonstrated the ability to go beyond their role of leadership in the State to contribute, as well, to the national reclamation and water conservation effort. As a group you are to be especially commended for your capacity to promote forward action and unanimity in water resource development, not only at the "grassroots" but also on a much broader level.

Today and tomorrow there is an adequate challenge to that leadership and that organizational morale.

The Garrison diversion unit, and all that it means for North Dakota and the Nation, now stands near the threshold of authorization.

In football parlance, the ball has been advanced to the 10-yard line, and the project supporters, the whole team, are poised for a final effort to cross the goal line.

The struggle has been rough and drawn-out and some "summer patriots" may be getting a little tired and war weary. Some have difficulty in recognizing that real progress has been made in recent months. We have, as you are aware, cleared the way with the payout study for the Missouri River Basin project, putting our financial house in order, both to contribute to the stability of the MRB and to reduce opposition to continued development in the basin. We have seen the enactment of needed companion legislation on rights-of-way, and fish and wildlife and recreation matters. The proposed development has won warm friends in the Department, in the White House, and in the Congress. It has a high legislative priority for the coming session.

With all these things now going in favor of Garrison diversion, there is little doubt in my mind that the North Dakota Water Users Association will fire up its offensive effort for the goal line drive in this coming session. The fight for the authorization and development of the Garrison diversion unit will go on—not only because North Dakota wants it and vitally needs it, but also because our

Nation needs major resource developments of this kind so that we may continue to grow and prosper and to maintain the abundance that typifies America.

As I look back on the long struggle for authorization of this great unit of the Missouri River Basin project, I know how the far-sighted economists and the humanitarians of our world feel in facing the daily disputes and obstacles they encounter as they constantly strive to make the people of the world lift their eyes from the present to the future. If we are to feed the vastly growing world population from our rapidly shrinking per capita acreage, we must look ahead and we must now, more than ever before, increase our efforts to obtain long-range resource development projects that are worthwhile and financially sound—in short, projects like the Garrison diversion unit. We who know the vital importance of water to economic growth in the West must continue the struggle and put forth ever more diligent effort toward maintaining our determination and aggressive actions to reach our goal of orderly water resource development.

It may seem discouraging to all of us that the 88th Congress did not give the "green light" to authorizing legislation, but let us not overlook that we have made good progress in the last 4 years. Two years ago the bill was reported by the Senate Interior Subcommittee, a major accomplishment. Its lack of progress in the House was understandable, because the Garrison diversion unit seemed to face the many and varied problems that had to be resolved in order to get the entire program in the Upper Missouri River Basin back on the track. Two years ago we were still trying to firm our MRB cost estimates; there were questions and local arguments unresolved about fish and wildlife, and questions particularly on cost allocation to these functions. There was the overriding question on power payout in the Missouri River Basin, a problem which plagued the committees of the Congress and the Office of the Secretary of the Interior for a long time. As you know, these questions, and others, were resolved and put squarely on the line with the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation in February 1964. This was another solid accomplishment.

My longtime personal friend, counselor, loyal supporter, and informed critic, the Honorable WAYNE ASPINALL, showed himself in that later role last evening as your banquet speaker when he mentioned waste in our planning efforts in the Missouri River Basin.

I will not attempt to deny that there have been some inefficiencies, waste motion, and duplication of effort in putting the comprehensive, multipurpose Missouri River Basin project into motion. In percentage of total construction costs of this great project directly affecting the daily welfare of the inhabitants of 10 basin States, these inefficiencies and waste motion in planning and getting the program underway become of minor significance.

Having said that, I admit, however, that this doesn't excuse inefficiency. I would point out that there are extenuating circumstances. In the case of reclamation, the Missouri River Basin undertaking involves the first attempt to bring the benefits of controlled water supply to areas already fully developed and settled under a dryland pattern of agriculture. All of the early reclamation developments had been planned and developed around arid areas where practically no agronomic benefit was realizable under natural rainfall conditions. The semi-arid regions involved in the Missouri River Basin area brought into consideration an entirely different set of circumstances which never before had been evaluated and taken into account in developing and constructing reclamation projects. This was an im-

portant factor involving some of the waste motion and inefficient planning efforts in the early days of this great multiple-purpose project.

Another first for the Missouri River Basin is that it was the first area of this magnitude where a comprehensive multiple-purpose undertaking involving several agencies of the Federal Government was attempted. So, again there was some waste motion and duplication of effort that is being avoided and will be avoided in the future since this was the guinea pig for this type of undertaking.

And I would point out also that the Congress by placing water management responsibilities in four different departments of government, each reporting to a different authorizing committee of the U.S. Congress, has built in some inescapable traps which make duplication of effort difficult, if not impossible, to avoid.

Congressman ASPINALL lists several projects, such as the Tiber Dam, Cedar Bluff Dam, Shadehill Dam, Heart Butte Dam, and Keyhole Dam, that were constructed under the 1944 Missouri River Basin authorization with significant allocations to irrigation in addition to flood control and other multiple-purpose functions but where, for one reason or another, irrigation has not yet been developed. We recognize that until the irrigation potential is developed, the full benefits from these already constructed dams will not be realized. On the other hand, most of these dams have paid for themselves several times over from the flood control benefits alone.

A graphic example of this was there for all to see last June in the case of the Tiber Dam, where there was 154,000 second-feet of water pouring into the reservoir and the flood was contained completely with only 1,200 second-feet being released, which was well within the channel capacity of the river. The nearby uncontrolled Teton River served as a terrible contrast where flooding and great destruction to life and property resulted.

In summary, I cannot and will not contend that the Missouri River Basin project development has been planned and constructed with ultimate wisdom and efficacy.

I can and will, however, defend before any tribunal that this project is in the national interest. It has already harnessed the rivers for the most part to avoid destructive floods that were characteristic of it in the past. About 2,400,000 kilowatts of electric capacity has been developed to stimulate industry. Navigation for 800 miles on the Missouri River is now a reality and additionally navigation on the Mississippi River below the confluence of the Missouri with that great river has been aided and abetted. Recreational opportunities have been created which were last year utilized by 9 million visitors of use. Municipal and industrial water supply for numerous cities and towns also comes from project works. A firmer economic base is assured by providing irrigation water to 250,000 acres of land previously subject to the vagaries of erratic rainfall with the accompanying feast and famine for the local communities. And there is much yet to be done and many benefits yet to be realized.

I was pleased to note that, on balance, Mr. ASPINALL finds that which has been accomplished to be worthwhile and that future development must proceed in an orderly and efficient manner. Now, I have conceded that mistakes were made and have enumerated some of the reasons why, in our judgment, some of them were unavoidable. There is one additional point that should be mentioned in this connection, and that is the fact that the comprehensive plan was actually authorized to provide a backlog of post World War II antidepression measures which, of course, never proved to be needed for that purpose. Nevertheless, this established the tempo of the times and coupled with major floods in the basin in 1947, resulted in a consensus decision to proceed with construction of



units, the detailed design and functioning of which had not been established to the requisite degree of detail.

This psychology of management has long since been abandoned by all concerned and there has not been a new construction start in the Missouri River Basin project since 1951 that has not been investigated in more detail than is now customary for authorization of new projects. Legislation supported by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Interior in the 88th Congress has now been enacted to effectively safeguard against any repetition of the 1940's in the future.

The Garrison diversion unit, as we have presented it, is no different from major projects we have developed elsewhere in the Western States. Perhaps in the past we have been too optimistic that this unit would be quickly approved by the Congress, and that we would soon have construction underway. But we have won friends and sympathetic interest and laid a legislative base for action that lends new optimism. Surely this is no time to bury our heads in the sand or relax our position. Rather, now is the time to step up efforts and to continue the good fight for the completion of your share of the Missouri River Basin plan of development; a development you have so vigorously supported for more than a quarter century, and one that will mean more to the future of North Dakota than any program ever considered in your State.

Our task is akin to nearly a century of great struggles for full development of our western resources. Just for a moment consider the odds faced by such men as Maj. John Wesley Powell, the redoubtable, one-armed crusader who risked his very life to explore the West of the 19th century, document data on its geography, its land, and rivers, and determine how best to develop the public domain. Powell was quick to realize that this vast unknown area was neither a great American desert which would be forever desolate, nor the great utopia of promoters where "rainfall would follow the plow." Although Powell died in 1902, he passed on with at least one evidence of success for his persistent crusade: the Congress had just passed the Reclamation Act, putting the U.S. Government in the business of reclaiming the arid region in accord with principles that great man and bona fide prophet had long suggested.

There's another classic story of prolonged struggle and eventual success in the Columbia River Basin of the Pacific Northwest. In mid-1930, Rufus Woods, editor of a small daily newspaper in Wenatchee, Wash., journeyed out to the deserted river channel of the Columbia River and said: "This desert would bloom like the Garden of Eden if there were a dam across the river." For 13 long years Rufus Woods talked about the potential of what became Grand Coulee Dam. For 13 years his ideas met resistance from everyone, but today this great multipurpose water development project majestically carries out its place in the overall development of our United States.

The Columbia Basin project is an engineering marvel, the result of the creative imaginative thinking and persistence of the people. However, there were others who condemned the project and there were those who said the power potential would never be put to use. How wrong they were. Today on the Columbia Basin project more than 450,000 acres are under ditch and work continues in orderly development to bring irrigation to the entire million-acre project. Electricity produced at the project aided significantly in the research and development of plutonium for an atomic arsenal, and within 4 years from the time the dam was completed we had developed the atomic bomb. Today, Grand Coulee power flows to all parts of our Pacific Northwest and

under plans approved in the 88th Congress will even be shipped southward within a few short years on high-voltage direct-current lines to light homes and turn the wheels of industry in areas as far away as Los Angeles and San Diego. Truly, the Columbia Basin project is a success story of its own, made possible by the dogged persistence of hundreds of persons over more than a decade of delay and discouragement.

Many great reclamation proposals have had their setbacks before enactment. Consider the central Arizona project which has been a subject of litigation for the past 15 years. Also consider the Fryngpan-Arkansas development now underway in Colorado. It was before the Congress for at least 12 years before its authorization in 1962. These projects and many others, including the Garrison diversion unit, have been in the minds of men for many years. And many of them have been authorized and initiated. I want you to keep in mind that for more than 60 years reclamation has met the challenge of helping the West keep abreast of the race to build a new, rapidly growing empire. Our dams, reservoirs, pumps, canals, and hydropowerplants, and the network of ditches and drains built by our irrigation farmers are economic links that strengthen our ever-expanding region, and the Nation as a whole.

The Garrison diversion unit is a natural to fit into the future pattern of western growth and development. And you in North Dakota, who have worked long and hard for this development can feel fortunate that both major political parties in the recent campaign promised early action for the Garrison diversion unit. This, together with assured support by the administration, gives the unit a built-in priority for the coming 89th Congress.

One of the many things in your favor for early enactment of legislation and for appropriations for the Garrison diversion unit is that we are in the midst of a crisis affecting the whole broad field of our natural resources, particularly with respect to the water resources of our Western States. This crisis is not so dramatically apparent at this time in North Dakota. Here you have had 7 good crop years out of the last 10—an unusual situation for the high plains area. But it is a challenge nonetheless real and critical to your future position in our Nation's growth.

Crises in water conservation seem to come at 30-year intervals. The present crisis is not now coming upon us as it did in the 1870's from a lack of understanding, or the need for national policies of the 1900's, or the drought and economic crisis of the 1930's. Rather, in the 1960's it comes from the very success of our Nation; the rush of progress symbolized by our expanding population, thriving industry, and our future requirements for food, all occurring simultaneously with a dwindling of our productive crop acreage. By the year 2000 our daily per capita water requirements are expected to triple.

There is little we can do in the field of water conservation that will materially alter our situation in the next 3 to 5 years. But we can, and must, build for the 1970's and 1980's and thereafter; just as those great men of foresight at the end of the last century were aware of us and our needs, we must be aware of the water requirements of the future. In our search for wise utilization of our water resources, we seek abundance and order, and we manifest our interest in land, esthetics and sound conservation as well as a sense of responsibility for utilization needs of future generations. We stress the unity of all resources and recognize the philosophical "live and let live" logic in the great chain of life.

Yes, there have been setbacks to resource development, but I am sure you will agree

that we are making progress on the important challenge of developing the water resources of our West. Our most recent construction programs—in fiscal 1964 and 1965—are testimony to this fact.

The \$318 million 1965 Bureau of Reclamation program tops that of all other years since 1950, except for the last year when a \$354 million program was in effect. Six new construction starts are funded in our 1965 program, including the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest electrical power transmission line intertie. The intertie, made possible by public and private electric power cooperation, includes the Nation's first and the world's longest direct-current transmission line.

This 2-year construction program involves a total of \$672 million. It will increase substantially not only our water resource facilities, but also our opportunities for water-based recreation, as well as provide important flood control benefits, enhance fish and wildlife resources, and provide pollution abatement, hydropower, and other multiple-purpose water development benefits.

Even without the authorization of Garrison diversion, this program did not overlook North Dakota.

As you are aware, we are currently working in North Dakota to develop the resources of the Knife and Cannonball River Basins. We are also working through the International Joint Commission for development of the Pembina River in northeastern North Dakota, and doing other work in the State.

We already have begun an investigation to reappraise the Knife division, and completion of the report is planned for 1965. Our most recent studies indicate a development potential of about 10,000 acres.

Mott Dam and Reservoir, a multipurpose development on the Cannonball River near Mott, would provide conservation storage and river regulation and permit irrigation of from 5,800 to 10,000 acres of new land by pumping to small tracts. Flood control, municipal water, recreation, and fish and wildlife enhancement also would be provided.

The Pembina unit in Cavalier and Pembina Counties also is currently under investigation. This is a part of the joint studies being made under the auspices of the International Joint Commission which is considering a plan for joint development by the United States and Canada of the water resource potential of the basin. Reclamation is participating with other Federal agencies in these joint studies. In the United States, it is planned that water would be stored in the potential Pembina Reservoir for irrigation of about 8,000 acres in North Dakota.

We all recognize that important as these tributaries are—and we want to move ahead on them in an orderly fashion—Garrison diversion is, of course, by its size and significance, the primary water resource interest of this State.

As Commissioner of Reclamation, I cannot promise authorization of this great irrigation development because it is beyond my power. This is a job that can only be done by the Congress. I know that your Governor, your State legislature, your congressional delegation, your State agencies, the North Dakota Water Users Association and other groups, and the many, many solid individuals—many of whom participated in presenting the Garrison unit plan to Congressmen last year—have not given up the fight because of the inability to get complete action in the 88th Congress. I know that you will unitedly pursue your cause in the 89th Congress with renewed hope and vigor when the new session begins on January 4, 1965.

Be assured that you can count on me and my staff, and Secretaries Udall and Holm, as you have in the past, to vigorously support this long overdue project which is so



vital to the future generations here and elsewhere in this great land of ours. With the kind of spirit and hard work you have already demonstrated, I know you will be successful in scoring a touchdown in your authorization drive, in eventually realizing the fruition of the diligent efforts to bring to North Dakota a well balanced, long-needed water resource development.

#### GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ANDREWS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, for the information of my colleagues, I am presenting herewith a resolution passed by the North Dakota State Legislature. North Dakota has waited a long time for the vital Garrison diversion project. To illustrate its importance to our State, our legislature, as its first resolution in this legislative session, urged the Congress for speedy reauthorization of this project which was originally authorized for our State 20 years ago as part of the overall plan for development of our great Missouri River Basin:

#### GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT

Whereas a substantial irrigation development for North Dakota was not only promised, but was specifically authorized as an integral part of the Missouri River Basin project in the Flood Control Act of 1944, to partially offset the loss experienced in the State by the acquisition of over 550,000 acres of valuable agricultural lands by the Federal Government for the construction of the Garrison and Oahe Dam and Reservoir projects on the Missouri River; and

Whereas the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation has determined from exhaustive studies and investigations conducted over the past 20 years, that the multiple-purpose Garrison diversion unit and irrigation development proposed therein is engineeringly and economically justifiable and feasible; and

Whereas legislation that would reauthorize the Garrison diversion unit has been proposed in each Congress since 1957, and has been the subject of extensive and thorough congressional hearings held during the intervening years, at which strong and consistent project support has been given by the State's congressional delegation, Governor, legislature, potential irrigators, farm, business, labor, industrial, professional, and agricultural organizations and leaders, as well as from basinwide and national water resources organizations, and by the last two administrations; and

Whereas the U.S. Senate in the 88th Congress, 2d session, passed a bill authorizing the construction of the initial 250,000-acre phase of the Garrison diversion unit, and the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the same session, reported out favorably and recommended for passage a bill, H.R. 1003, as amended, authorizing the construction of the initial phase of the Garrison diversion unit, which report and amended bill were acceptable to the sponsors of the reauthorizing legislation, but said H.R. 1003 failed to receive House action because of lack of time before sine die adjournment of the 88th Congress: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate*

*concurring therein), That the 39th Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota hereby expresses its unequivocal support for the early development of the Garrison diversion unit and fully concurs in and endorses the presentations by Gov. William L. Guy and other proponent witnesses at the hearings in the 88th Congress on S. 178 and H.R. 1003, and companion bills; and be it further*

*Resolved, That the 89th Congress be and it is hereby most respectfully urged to take early action to effect enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of the Garrison diversion unit along the lines of S. 34, H.R. 1718, and H.R. 237, 89th Congress; and be it further*

*Resolved, That copies hereof be transmitted by the secretary of state to the members of the North Dakota congressional delegation, the chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, President of the Senate, Speaker of the House, the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Water and Power, and the Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation.*

#### PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO PERMIT INDIVIDUAL STATES TO APPORTION ONE HOUSE OF THEIR STATE LEGISLATURE ON FACTORS NOT LIMITED SOLELY TO POPULATION

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, today I have submitted a bill calling for the adoption of a constitutional amendment which would permit individual States to apportion one house of their State legislatures on factors not limited solely to population. I believe that failure to adopt the amendment would result in a drastic change in our whole concept of representative democracy.

It would be a change completely at variance with the concept laid down by the Founding Fathers of the Republic and followed for more than 180 years of American history. The most significant thing about the Supreme Court decision is that the judicial branch of Government, which is not directly chosen by the people and which is appointed, not elected to positions of lifetime tenure, has in effect changed the law of the land without regard to the Congress, the only lawmaking body created in the Constitution. It has made law, not interpreted it.

If the Supreme Court decision on reapportionments is allowed to stand, the States of the Nation are precluded from electing their State legislative assemblies on the same basis which now prevails at the Federal level. Missouri's "little Federal system" will be scuttled if the Supreme Court carries out the same line of reasoning. It ultimately may decide that Missouri should have fewer Senators in the U.S. Senate than does New York because there are more people in New York.

The reason for establishing a bicameral system in Missouri and in 49 of the 50

States is to prevent a majority of one from trampling the rights of the minority at any given moment. It is an inherent part of our national system of checks and balances reflected at the State level. But under the Supreme Court ruling, the question is certain to arise, what reason is there for maintaining two houses, both of which are based on the same factor—population, to the exclusion of all other factors including community interests, economic factors, and diverse needs? The ruling almost certainly will mean that State legislatures will be further removed from the people they represent due to concentration of power in huge metropolitan areas. In most rural counties, most of the people know their State legislator as well as they do the elected officials in the county courthouse. Make the same survey in cities of a half million people or more and you will find that not 1 out of 10,000 has ever met or even knows the name of their representative in the State assembly.

This situation usually leads to legislation by pressure groups and voting blocs in large urban areas, where legislators are responsible not to individuals but to pressure groups which purport to represent individuals.

How ironic that at a time in our history when we have never been more cognizant of the rights of minorities, the Supreme Court has passed a law which threatens to wipe out consideration for minority viewpoints.

Whether the constitutional amendment which I and others have submitted will be voted on in the House of Representatives depends on whether the people care enough to want the very best form of government ever devised maintained for posterity.

#### NEEDED CUT IN CERTAIN EXCISE TAXES

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, in his state of the Union message President Johnson spoke of the need to keep the Nation prosperous, and of the need for seeking full employment. He made a reference to providing more money to be left in the hands of consumers through a cut in excise taxes.

Republicans in the House have for several months asked for a cut in certain excise taxes, and are encouraged to know now that our proposal will have bipartisan support. The need has been with us for some time.

Today I am reintroducing my bill of last year calling for a two-stage reduction in the existing Federal retailers excise taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, and luggage and handbags.

My bill calls for a reduction from the current 10-percent tax to 5 percent on



July 1, 1965, and the complete repeal of the tax a year later. There may be proposals made for a single stage repeal of the tax to be effective on enactment. The method by which we repeal the tax is not so vital as the need for repeal, and I know that a reasonable plan recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means will enjoy wide support in this body.

The Third District of Minnesota is a suburban district. Most suburban residents, even more than others in the country, are overtaxed. The costs of new schools and community services of all kinds fall most heavily on the young families who are setting up their homes in newly developed residential areas around our large cities.

It is neither feasible nor desirable to increase substantially the existing State income taxes, or real estate taxes, personal property taxes, and general sales taxes.

One way to relieve the burden on suburban families is to get the Federal Government out of the retail excise tax field so far as it is possible to do so consistent with the need for Federal fiscal responsibility.

The Federal Government entered the excise tax field in a so-called temporary and "emergency" move when we were involved in general war. Our continued wrongful usurpation of this revenue source reminds me that "there is nothing so permanent as a temporary Federal program."

An effort to eliminate the taxes in two stages was made during 1964 by Republican Members of the House. On June 17, 1964, our effort failed on a vote of 207 to 185. All but one Republican voted for the cut, and 206 Democrats voted "No."

Our 1964 Republican Party platform affirms the pledge to remove Federal excise taxes. And the 1964 Democratic Party platform says:

We should carefully review all our excise taxes and eliminate those that are obsolete.

We should have acted on the campaign pledges of both parties during 1964. Now with the President's support there is all the more reason to move ahead in this area, and I urge support for my bill.

A bill to reduce the retailers excise taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, and luggage and handbags from 10 percent to 5 percent on July 1, 1965, and to repeal such taxes on July 1, 1966

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

# SECTION 1. REDUCTION ON JULY 1, 1965, OF RETAILERS EXCISE TAXES ON JEWELRY, FURS, TOILET PREPARATIONS, AND LUGGAGE FROM 10 PERCENT TO 5 PERCENT.

The following provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are each amended by inserting "(except that in the case of sales at retail after June 30, 1965, the rate shall be 5 percent in lieu of 10 percent)" after "10 percent of the price for which so sold":

(1) Section 4001 (relating to jewelry and related items).

(2) Section 4011 (relating to furs).

(3) Section 4021 (relating to toilet preparations).

(4) Section 4031 (relating to luggage, handbags, etc.).

## SEC. 2. REPEAL OF RETAILERS EXCISE TAXES ON JEWELRY, FURS, TOILET PREPARATIONS, AND LUGGAGE ON JULY 1, 1966.

(A) IN GENERAL.—Effective with respect to articles sold at retail after June 30, 1966, subchapters A (relating to jewelry and related items), B (relating to furs), C (relating to toilet preparations), and D (relating to luggage, handbags, etc.) of chapter 31 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are repealed.

(b) TECHNICAL CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Effective with respect to articles sold at retail after June 30, 1966:

(1) Chapter 31 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to retailers excise taxes) is amended by striking out the heading and table of subchapters and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

### "CHAPTER 31—RETAILERS EXCISE TAX ON SPECIAL FUELS

"SUBCHAPTER A. Tax on special fuels.

"SUBCHAPTER B. Special provisions applicable to tax on special fuels."

(2) The table of chapters for subtitle D of such Code is amended by striking out

"CHAPTER 31. Retailers excise taxes."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"CHAPTER 31. Retailers excise tax on special fuels."

(3) Subchapter E of chapter 31 of such Code is redesignated as subchapter A, and the heading of such subchapter is amended to read as follows:

#### "Subchapter A—Tax on special fuels"

(4) Subchapter F of chapter 31 of such Code is redesignated as subchapter B, and the heading of such subchapter is amended to read as follows:

"Subchapter B—Special provisions applicable to tax on special fuels"

(5) Sections 4051 through 4053 of such Code are repealed and the table of sections for subchapter B (as redesignated by paragraph (4) and this subsection) is amended by striking out the items relating to sections 4051, 4052, and 4053.

(6) Sections 4055 and 4057 of such Code are each amended by striking out ", in the case of the tax imposed by section 4041."

(7) (A) Section 4224 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to exemption for articles taxable as jewelry) is repealed.

(B) The table of sections for subchapter G of chapter 32 of such Code is amended by striking out

"SEC. 4224. Exemptions for articles taxable as jewelry."

(8) Section 6011(c) of such Code (relating to return of retailers excise taxes by suppliers) is repealed.

(9) Section 6416 of such Code (relating to certain taxes on sales and services) is amended as follows:

(A) Subsection (a)(1) is amended by striking out "chapter 31 (retailers taxes)."

(B) Subsection (a)(1)(B) is amended by striking out clause (i) and redesignating clauses (ii) and (iii) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively.

(C) Subsection (a)(2) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) This subsection shall not apply to an overpayment of tax under paragraph (1), (3) (A) or (B), or (5) of subsection (b) of this section."

(D) Subsection (a)(3) is amended by striking out subparagraph (B), by redesignating subparagraphs (C) and (D) as subparagraphs (B) and (C), respectively, and by striking out "(ii)" in the subparagraph so redesignated as subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof "(i)".

(E) Subsection (b)(1) is amended by striking out "31 or" and by striking out "(in the case of a tax imposed by chapter 32)".

(F) Subsection (b)(5) is amended by striking out "4053(b)(1) or" each place it appears.

(G) Subsection (d) is repealed.

(H) Subsection (e) is amended by striking out "subchapter E" and inserting in lieu thereof "subchapter A".

(10) (A) Section 7261 of such Code (relating to criminal penalty for representation that retailers' excise tax is excluded from price of article) is repealed.

(B) The table of sections for subchapter B of chapter 75 of such Code is amended by striking out

"Sec. 7261. Representation that retailers' excise tax is excluded from price of article."

## PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO REPLACE CURRENT LEGISLATION FOR WHEAT AND FEED GRAINS

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, my proposal (H.R. 1595) to replace current legislation for wheat and feed grains, is intended to create conditions under which farmers may earn and get a high per-family real income in a manner which will preserve freedom and opportunity.

This objective, in my opinion, can best be accomplished by preserving the market price system as the principal influence in allocating the use of farm resources. The American farmer is more capable than government of planning the use of his acreage and other productive resources.

Freedom to produce and market carries with it the duty to accept the discipline of competition.

### PRESENT PROGRAMS HAVE FAILED

Experience with the present temporary wheat certificate plan clearly indicates the need for a sounder and less complex approach to the economic problems of wheat growers.

New wheat legislation should be enacted in time to eliminate the necessity for another referendum on the wheat certificate plan provided by existing law which was rejected by wheat growers in 1963.

The present "emergency" feed grain program was initiated in 1961 and has been extended with minor modifications since that time. Considering the vast acreage of land diverted from production by the program, the growth in market attained during its 4 years of operation, the poor crop in 1964, and the continuing surplus of feed grains, the program clearly has failed to solve the feed grain problem.

Furthermore, the programs for wheat and feed grains have aggravated the price and income problems of livestock producers and have proved an enormous financial burden on the Federal Treasury.

My proposal for meeting the economic problems of wheat, feed grain, and livestock producers, is as follows.



Authority for wheat marketing quotas and acreage allotments would be terminated, and the multiple-price wheat plan provisions of the 1962 Farm Act would be repealed. The provision of the Agricultural Act of 1964, authorizing the 1964 and 1965 program for wheat would be allowed to expire. The 1963 Feed Grain Act, which applies only to the 1964 and 1965 crops of feed grains, would be allowed to expire.

These actions are necessary in order to clear the slate, beginning with the 1966 crops, for a new approach to the wheat and feed grain problem. Efforts to control wheat and feed grain production by means of acreage allotments and marketing quota programs have failed dismally. They have created inefficiencies in the production of farm commodities. They have increased production costs. They have shifted the surplus problem from one commodity to another.

My bill would enable each farmer to decide for himself which grains he should grow, how much of each he can best produce, and whether he would be better off to place a part or all of his farm under a transitional cropland retirement contract.

#### PRICE SUPPORTS BASED ON MARKET PRICES

Beginning with the 1966 crop, price supports for wheat would be set at the U.S. farm price equivalent of the average world market price during the immediately preceding three marketing years—currently about \$1.34 per bushel. Premiums and discounts would be used to reflect market demand for milling and baking quality. For corn, supports would be 90 percent of the average price received by farmers for corn during the immediately preceding 3 years. Currently this would mean a price support of about \$1 per bushel for corn. Supports for other feed grains would be related to corn with differentials to reflect differences in feeding value.

Under no circumstances would the price support level be less than 50 percent of the applicable parity price, currently about \$1.26 per bushel for wheat and 78 cents per bushel for corn. At the present time support prices computed by the market price formulas would be considerably higher than 50 percent of parity in all cases. This approach would eliminate administrative discretion with respect to price support levels for wheat and feed grains. It would automatically adjust support prices to changing supply and demand conditions.

Support prices set in this manner would not impede the workings of the market; would not be an incentive to increase production; and yet, would provide protection against any substantial drop in wheat and feed grain prices.

Because price supports set in this manner would not be an artificial stimulant to production, it would not be necessary to couple them with restrictions on production or marketing of grains.

#### LIMITED CROPLAND RETIREMENT

My bill provides a limited land retirement program to ease the adjustment of agricultural production to effective market demand. It would be temporary and voluntary, provide for competitive bids, take cropland out of production for 3 to

5 years—except that land being diverted to timber could be placed under contract for up to 10 years—with emphasis on whole farms, and prohibit the grazing of retired acres. Under no circumstances could total rental payments in any one year exceed \$750 million.

The Secretary would be authorized for a period of 3 years to enter into contracts for the voluntary retirement of cropland with emphasis on whole-farm retirement.

A cropland retirement program of this nature would lead to the withdrawal of much greater productive capacity per dollar cost and would eliminate most of the administrative problems associated with the emergency-type programs of recent years. Cropland retirement would terminate completely after the limited transitional period.

Producers of all commodities would be given an opportunity to participate in the cropland retirement program. Producers would be required to establish and maintain proper vegetative cover and control of noxious weeds on the retired acres. They would not be allowed to graze or harvest any crop off the land. The voluntary nature of this proposed cropland retirement program minimizes the likelihood that it could have any adverse effects on individual counties or communities; however, to make certain that no area would be adversely affected, the Secretary would be directed to place a maximum limitation on the percentage of total cropland which could be retired in any one State or county.

Cost would be less than one-half the cost of present programs.

#### CCC DUMPING PROHIBITED

To protect farmers against competition from the release of CCC surplus stocks of wheat and feed grains, sale of these stocks at less than 125 percent of prevailing support levels, plus reasonable carrying charges, would be prohibited except for sales that are offset by open-market purchases. This exception is designed to provide needed flexibility for the maintenance of good inventory management practice.

The isolation of CCC stocks from the market would reinstate immediately the traditional functions of the market system in establishing farm commodity prices and guiding agricultural production. Farmers should not be handicapped by ceilings put on current commodity prices through the dumping of CCC stocks, which have been built up under unsound programs of the past. Farmers' experience with the CCC dumping of both feed grains and wheat in the last 4 years has been disastrous.

The proposal to terminate both wheat allotments and the present feed grain program and to institute a cropland retirement program puts all grains on the same basis. It provides no restrictions on individual farm operations except those applying to land voluntarily retired under the program. All farmers will be completely free to use all their noncontracted cropland as they wish, except for crops under marketing quotas. This would lead to a restoration of competitive markets and more efficient production. Thus, it would lead also to more efficient

and more profitable livestock, dairy, and poultry production.

This program would provide farmers the opportunity to use their land, capital, and labor for the production of commodities which promise greatest returns and highest possible net income.

It gets away from historic bases, yield factors, minimum allotments, and the other problems inherent in Government efforts to regulate individual farming operations. It preserves the opportunity for each farmer to make his own decisions. It provides for needed adjustments in resource use without forcing every farmer to retire a part of his farm without regard to his individual situation. It uses support prices to encourage orderly marketing and orderly adjustments in production rather than to fix prices. In order to give the market an opportunity to function it provides protection against the dumping of CCC stocks.

This program gives assurance of increasing family farm income, and improving farmers' ability to build markets at home and abroad.

The general public will support a reasonable expenditure for Government farm programs, provided we can demonstrate that these programs will improve the situation instead of making it worse. The program I propose would be a bridge to an improved agricultural situation in which the need for Government expenditures will be greatly and permanently reduced.

#### BREAD TAX ON WHEAT SHOULD BE DROPPED

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, in a letter today, I suggest that President Johnson begin his program to reduce Federal excise taxes by dropping the bread tax, the excise tax on wheat processed for food.

This fee was provided in the wheat certificate bill enacted by Congress last year at the President's behest.

I also invited Presidential support for my bill, H.R. 1595, a proposal replacing current programs for both wheat and feed grains and of course dropping the bread tax. It would base price supports on market prices and authorize Government rental of farmland within fixed limits during a 3-year transition period.

The bread tax is the heaviest, most excessive and most regressive of all Federal excise taxes. It hits hardest the lowest income people who have the least ability to pay. It has frequently—and accurately—been described as a tax on poor people.

By a country mile, it is the most burdensome Federal excise tax on the books. Last year it amounted to 50 percent of the market value of wheat. The Secretary of Agriculture fixed the tax at 70 cents for each bushel of wheat milled for



food. The support level was only \$1.30, and the market price averaged about \$1.37. Therefore the tax amounted to half the price of the wheat.

Of all Federal excise taxes, I know of none that even approaches 50 percent of the commodity value. The tax on luxury furs, for example, is 10 percent.

And to make matters worse, the Department of Agriculture has announced that the excise tax on wheat for food this year is even higher—75 cents a bushel—and the price support is even lower—\$1.25 a bushel.

If the Department of Agriculture continues its policy of massive dumping of Government wheat stocks, the market price will undoubtedly again decline with the drop in the support level. Therefore, the excise tax on wheat for food this year will be about 60 percent of wheat's market value.

The wheat certificate plan was enacted very reluctantly last year by the Congress. It passed the House of Representatives by only 10 votes, and that margin clearly would have not developed without the President's support and insistence. I am sure the Congress will gladly and gratefully respond if he will insist that it be dropped.

The bread tax seems totally out of place in the President's antipoverty program. Indeed, it has all the earmarks of an anti-anti-poverty program. The cost of this tax is, of course, passed on to consumers, and Department of Agriculture statistics show clearly that wheat flour consumption goes up sharply as family income goes down.

*Home use of wheat products per person per week*

Annual income per family	Southern United States (pounds)	U.S. average (pounds)
Under \$2,000	4.44	3.83
\$2,000 to \$2,999	3.68	3.15
\$3,000 to \$3,999	3.41	2.84
\$4,000 to \$4,999	3.29	2.69
\$5,000 to \$5,999	3.11	2.58
\$6,000 to \$7,999	2.90	2.46
\$8,000 to \$9,999	2.56	2.29

*Percent spent for wheat products*

Annual income per family:	
Under \$2,000	6.6
\$2,000 to \$2,999	5.9
\$3,000 to \$3,999	5.8
\$4,000 to \$4,999	5.3
\$5,000 to \$5,999	5.1
\$6,000 to \$7,999	4.8
\$8,000 to \$9,999	4.6

Last year the bread tax totaled \$350 million, and this year it will reach still more deeply into the pockets of those least able to pay.

Ironically, most of the proceeds of this tax on poor people are handed to the highest income wheat farmers of the country. Department of Agriculture statistics last year showed that 1,300 big wheat farmers would qualify for annual payments averaging \$15,000, but the little fellows—over a million of them—would qualify for annual payments averaging only \$58. It was such a bad deal for the small farmers in 1964 that two-thirds of those eligible did not sign up.

In the President's state of the Union message he called for revamp of farm programs to benefit the farmers that

need help the most. By this standard, the wheat certificate program is headed 180 degrees in the wrong direction.

I hope the President will begin this program to reduce Federal excise taxes by dropping the excise tax on wheat for food. Farmers, consumers and taxpayers alike would welcome this action. It would be a special blessing to poor people.

#### FEDERAL FARM FABLE

I was impelled to make this suggestion to President Johnson when I recorded this Federal farm fable of the 1960's, an account of the remarkable experiences of Zig Wheat and Zag Cotton.

Once upon a time not so long ago several of the best fed farm creatures were sitting around planning how to improve the lot of the very same best fed farm creatures. The leaders of this friendly group were Zig Wheat and Zag Cotton.

It was after the sad 21st of May in the year 1963 when the wheat growers had rejected by an overwhelming margin the strict control wheat certificate program. Earlier, the wise turkey growers had rejected a turkey control program.

Zig Wheat and his cohorts in and out of Government reminisced about the farmer's perversity in rejecting the certificate program. It would have required the wheat miller to pay a 50-percent manufacturers' excise tax amounting to \$350 million which would be shifted to consumers in the form of higher bread prices. A large majority of this huge tax take would then be handed to the largest wheat growers. Zig Wheat knew that the lowest income people consume the most wheat products per capita. He knew that one-half of the nonwhite population has an annual income of less than \$3,000. Thus, the tax must fall on those least able to pay and nonwhite people would be hit hardest of all.

Also, he knew that the small wheat growers were required to cut back more sharply than the largest producers. Thus, the whole program was an anti-anti-poverty proposal.

The Nation's poor heaved a sigh of relief when the farmers rejected the straitjacket. But this made best fed Zig Wheat and his control-minded friends in Government unhappy.

Zig Wheat turned to Zag Cotton and said "What is your problem?" Zag Cotton replied: "The present cotton program prices cotton too high to the mills in the United States. We are losing markets to manmade fibers here at home. Also, foreign mills get U.S. cotton at lower prices through the export subsidy. They manufacture cotton cloth and ship it back to the United State at cut-rate prices. Therefore, U.S. cotton mills are losing markets every which way."

Zig Wheat stroked his straw beard for a moment, then said to Zag Cotton, "Why don't you meet this problem with a program which includes lower market prices and payments to the producers?"

Zag answered, "We are afraid that the public will be upset by the tremendously large individual payments it would entail and will insist that Congress put a maximum on payments. You and I know how big a proportion of the money goes to the big plantation boys."

Zag replied, "Oh, we don't worry about that. We know our way around."

Zag then suggested that each develop his own program and try their luck when the 1964 Congress convened.

They wished each other a happier New Year and each went to work with a vigor inspired by the motto, "Take what your country can be made to give you."

Several months later, they were ready. Each had worked out his own program. The two proposals were unrelated, dissimilar and contradictory in policy. They were as different as night and day, except that in each scheme long-suffering Mr. American Taxpayer-Consumer would foot the bill.

The legislative problem called for a classic example of back scratching, log rolling and arm twisting.

Zig Wheat, in fear of losing another farmer referendum, asked for and got a so-called voluntary program that had no referendum.

Zag Cotton asked for and got a compulsory program with a farmer referendum.

Zig Wheat asked for and got a payment program financed by a \$350 million manufacturers' excise tax on wheat at 50 percent of the raw value, to be paid for by the consumer. The wheat millers had a very poor year in 1964 and expect another poor year in 1965.

Zag Cotton asked for and got a direct payment program for farmers financed from general tax funds. In addition, provision was made for a \$350 million manufacturers' excise tax in reverse which authorized multi-million-dollar payments to cotton mills from the Federal Treasury. Although supposedly designed to reduce the cost of cotton textiles to the consumer, the prices of most cotton textiles are actually higher today than they were a year earlier. And profits of cotton mills are substantially higher too.

Zig Wheat asked for and got a provision under which small wheatgrowers had to take a double acreage cut in order to be eligible for payments.

Zag Cotton asked for and got an increased payment for the small cotton-grower for which the farmers had to do nothing additional in the way of compliance. They just had to keep doing what they had been doing all along.

Zig Wheat asked for and got a provision under which only those who complied—about 40 percent—mainly the largest farms, got payments.

Zag Cotton asked for and got payments for all farms, big and small, plus extra bonus payments for the small farms. All the cotton mills, big and small, would share the financial bonanza of the Treasury payments—excise tax in reverse. The Textile Workers Union hoped to share in the golden shower and lobbied for the bill. However, now they are complaining and saying the mills failed to share the benefits with the workers.

Zig Wheat argued that the bill would not cause prices for flour and bread to rise.

Zag Cotton argued that the bill would cut the price of cotton textiles.

Zig and Zag knew that neither group had a bill which by itself could pass the



Congress. But, by marriage, they could produce an offspring.

Zig Wheat and his cohorts worked the wheat States; Zag Cotton and his cohorts worked the cotton States; the textile labor unions and the mills worked their own backyards; and all this plus some fancy arm twisting got the wheat-cotton bill of 1964 through Congress.

And this is how the first nonrelated Siamese twins—who really were not twins at all—came into being. Zig Wheat and Zag Cotton had made medical history on the legislative operating table.

#### FIRST SEA TRIALS OF THE U.S.S. "SAM RAYBURN"

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the first successfully completed sea trials of the U.S.S. *Sam Rayburn*, the 28th Polaris type submarine and the 50th nuclear submarine to become operational, I received a letter from Adm. H. G. Rickover which I herewith include as a part of my remarks.

Among the many observations made by Admiral Rickover about our late beloved Speaker, and my dear and valued friend, the admiral well said:

There is hardly a name in our history so bound up with democratic traditions and ideals as that of the man for whom this ship is named.

The letter follows:

U.S.S. "SAM RAYBURN" (SSBN635),  
CARE OF FLEET POST OFFICE,  
New York, N.Y., November 4, 1964.

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK,  
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. McCORMACK: We have just successfully completed first sea trials of the U.S.S. *Sam Rayburn*, our 28th Polaris-type submarine and the 50th nuclear submarine to become operational. The *Rayburn* was built by the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co. of Newport News, Va.

This ship is named for one of the Nation's foremost legislators and parliamentary technicians, Sam Rayburn, of Texas (1882-1961). A public servant during his entire adult life, a politician in the best sense of the word, Rayburn served in the House of Representatives longer than anyone before him: almost half a century, or more than one-fourth the life span of the United States. During the last 24 years of his life he was either majority or minority leader or Speaker of the House. He held the speakership for 17 years—the longest record and double the one previously held by Henry Clay.

His tenure in the House coincided with a period of tremendous change in the fortunes of our country, of innumerable crises and as many triumphs; a period which saw the United States rise from relative obscurity to the pinnacle of world power, its population more than doubling, its affluence multiplying many times over. Government grew accordingly, as reflected in the Federal budget which rose from \$1 to \$84 billion.

Rayburn's name is connected with many important pieces of legislation, particularly after he became chairman of the Commit-

tee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in 1931. He was the author of the Federal Communications Act, the Securities Exchange Act, the Rayburn-Wheeler Holding Company Act, and the Rural Electrification Act. He has been called the principal architect of the legislative program of the Roosevelt era. In August 1941 he persuaded the House to extend the draft act. The vote was 203 to 202. Thus narrowly was dissipation of our military manpower averted just 4 months prior to Pearl Harbor.

Rayburn's reputation as a statesman and skilled parliamentarian, however, rests chiefly on his handling of the speakership. To quote the late Clarence Cannon: "The foundations of the growing power of the speakership were laid under Speaker Thomas Reed, flowered under Speaker Joseph Cannon, and have culminated under Speaker Rayburn . . . in all the long and stately procession of illustrious men who have occupied that exalted position he is the greatest and the most powerful."

The speakership is an ancient and venerable institution going back to 14th century England. Congress took it over from the colonial legislatures. Curiously, the office now puts its incumbent next in succession after the Vice President. If Rayburn's life did not quite follow the tradition of log cabin to White House, it came close; for the speakership is held to be the second most important public office in the land.

Sam Rayburn was born in Tennessee, 1 of 11 children of a Confederate cavalryman. The family moved to a 40-acre cotton farm in Texas when he was 5. There he attended a 1-room schoolhouse and did the usual chores expected of farm children. When he wasn't farming he read voraciously. As he later remarked, "By the time I was 9 or 10 I had read every history book I could find . . . everything I could get hold of about Washington, Hamilton, Jefferson, the Adamses, Monroe, Madison, and all I could about the men then in public life." By the time he was 13, he had decided on a public career. He didn't lose time reaching his goal.

At 17 he entered college, working his way through by sweeping floors and milking cows. Upon graduation he taught school. At 24 he was elected to the State legislature, serving 6 years, the last 2 as speaker of the house. He studied law between sessions and was admitted to the bar. He was 30 when first elected to Congress.

Despite his rise to positions of power and influence, Rayburn remained a plain, homespun man. President Johnson said of him that there wasn't anyone in the United States who couldn't see him "if they were willing to sit a spell. To the dismay of his staff, he made his own appointments—often on the back of an old envelope in his hip pocket. And he read his own mail. 'When someone writes me on tablet paper with a lead pencil,' he once told me, 'I figure what he's writing me about is pretty important to him.'" And once, in talking of Flag Springs, the little town where he attended school, Rayburn said: "All of us are just a little way from Flag Springs. You know I just missed being a tenant farmer by a gnat's heel."

There is hardly a name in our history so bound up with our democratic traditions and ideals as that of the man for whom this ship is named.

"He was the last tie between the frontier concepts and ideals of Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Davy Crockett, Sam Houston, and Abraham Lincoln and the new frontier of science."

Respectfully,

H. G. RICKOVER.

#### SALUTE TO THE IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, one of the most popular of indoor sports in this country—and I suppose everywhere else—is the fine art of baiting bureaucrats. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the bureaucrat is nothing more nor less than a man doing a job. Public service demands people who are dedicated to the ideal of serving the public. I want to take note today of the fine work of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and salute them for doing an efficient and effective job from the district level all the way to the Commissioner's level.

In San Antonio, the district office of the Immigration Service probably processes more work than any comparable office in the Southwest or the entire United States. John Holland—a career man in his job—and his fine staff of dedicated people administer a difficult law in a quiet, effective, and most important, humane way.

Immigration involves every human condition and problem. It takes years of experience to learn to cope with these problems, and it takes a real desire for compassionate service to mankind to work well with the situations immigration men must face.

My office processes several hundred immigration cases every year and I address dozens of queries to John Holland and Commissioner Farrell and his staff. I have always had a prompt and informed response; I have always been treated with courtesy and always found the help I sought.

Commissioner Farrell, his staff people, his district director, John Holland, and his line officers in my area have proved time and again to be the kind of people we need in Government. Theirs is a difficult assignment; it may well be one of the most difficult assignments in our Government. I am proud to say that the job is being done well.

#### WE TREAT OUR MILITARY SHABBILY

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, last week, on January 4, I introduced H.R. 1026, a bill to increase the subsistence allowance of all members of the uniformed services to \$75 per month. I originally introduced this measure during the 88th Congress. Its purpose is to improve the standard of living of the military man. Specifically, it would permit tens of thousands of men in the Armed Forces to purchase enough food each month so that they might have a nutritious diet.



In the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post a former major in the U.S. Army speaks his mind on the reasons that compelled him to resign his commission after 13 years as an officer. It is a tale that should cover each and every one of us with shame. It is a tale of substandard housing at outrageous costs to the military man, of low wages, and of the general frustrating conditions that prevail in the Armed Forces today. This article by Marion T. Wood needs to be read by all Americans, for in the process of analyzing his own experiences in the Army he placed military life in a perspective rarely seen by the average civilian. Yet, it is a perspective built on truth and on fact.

Mr. Wood raises questions in his article that need to be answered. Perhaps the most important question is, Why do we treat the military man as a second-class citizen? This question strikes at the very cornerstone of our society. It is strange indeed that a free and open society as ours would create a second-class citizenry and leave our national defenses to it. Such a course of action, in my opinion, is suicidal.

Men are leaving the Armed Forces every day in disgust and frustration, humiliated by the country which asked them to dedicate their lives in service to it. Do we really believe that our missiles and bombs will defend us by themselves? Do we not know that it takes men—dedicated men—who are willing to live under the civil disabilities of military life, and then die defending their country? Where will we get such men after they have left us, as Marion D. Wood did, wondering why they allowed themselves to be played for suckers? Shall we hire mercenaries?

With unanimous consent I am inserting the article by Marion T. Wood, entitled "We Treat Our Military Shabbily," from the January 16, 1965, issue of the Saturday Evening Post:

WE TREAT OUR MILITARY SHABBLILY  
(By Marion T. Wood)

After 13 years as an officer of the U.S. Army, I recently resigned, frustrated and disillusioned. I was supposed to be guarding something grandly called the American way of life. But, by a cruel paradox, the society I had sworn to protect is a society that is indifferent and even hostile toward me and my comrades.

Built into the very foundation of this Nation is a distrust of soldiers, especially in peacetime. The Declaration of Independence denounces the British for keeping standing armies in the Colonies in times of peace. The third amendment in the Bill of Rights specifically prohibits the quartering of soldiers in peacetime "in any house without the consent of the owner." In war, the historic pattern has always been the same: When war was declared, the Nation suddenly rallied an army of civilians, trained and led by professionals who had long endured the persistent apathy and frequent scorn of their country. After the war, the civilians discarded their uniforms and became, as veterans, members of a privileged class. They were rewarded for service after getting out of the Army; those who stayed in were neither rewarded nor even long remembered.

After World War II, the pattern of hostility toward soldiers continued. Typically, the benefits of the GI bill were extended to veterans, but not to those who decided to make

the Army (or any other service) a career. Then, however, for the first time in history we found ourselves in a twilight state of neither peace nor war. The cold war suddenly challenged our historic attitude that soldiers were "good" in wartime and "bad" in peacetime, and that the best soldier was an ex-soldier.

It was in this twilight that I chose the Army as a profession. Many friends and relatives were stunned. "You must be out of your mind," said one friend. Like so many civilians, they felt that the Army was a place for people who, as it was usually put, "could not do well on the outside." As a matter of fact, I had been doing well on the outside, which in my case was a small college. Membership in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps—ROTC—was required for the first 2 years. I enjoyed the experience enough to continue it during my last 2 years in college. My scholastic record was high enough to qualify me for a Regular Army commission at graduation. As a new infantry lieutenant in June 1950, I fully intended to make the Army my career.

As I look back I still see patriotism as the basic reason I decided to become an Army officer. I have not been able to find a more sophisticated explanation. Soldiers are generally embarrassed when they try to explain what it means to be a soldier. Phrases such as "service to your nation" and "guardians of democracy" stick in a soldier's throat, as well they should. Good soldiers are soldiers because soldiering is a very real, very meaningful profession. This is especially true in a society where many men with high-paying jobs make no contribution to society. Soldiers, at least, have the satisfaction of knowing their nation needs them. Yet from that nation, soldiers often receive shabby treatment.

My introduction to how the Army treats its own came when the Army took 6 weeks to transform me from a college boy to a rifle-platoon leader, responsible for the lives of some 40 men. Six weeks is not much time. Then I was shipped to Japan, where the Army was frantically putting together outfits to send to Korea. Some consisted mainly of stockade soldiers—men taken from military jails—and untrained South Koreans. I landed in Wonsan, North Korea, in November 1950, without winter clothing.

Our equipment was often shoddy or in short supply. Weapons misfired; ammunition was scarce. There were not enough magazines for our automatic rifles. We were on the line eight out of nine months. There were few formal battles or engagements. It was a dirty little war, and the worst part of it was the feeling that no one really cared.

When I got back in the States in 1951, after my tour in Korea, I suddenly was a peacetime soldier. I had been warned that a soldier was a second-class citizen in many Army towns, the communities that live off the payrolls of military bases. The principal industry in most of these towns was taking soldiers for every dime they had.

In many Army towns the citizen most discriminated against is the soldier. Some policemen arrest them with flagrant entrapment techniques. I have seen police wait for a soldier to walk out of a tavern and enter his car. As he pulled away, he was stopped and arrested for driving while intoxicated. Instead of protesting such injustice, the Army condoned it. Man after man was hauled before civilian authorities on such charges, convicted, and fined. Then these men were usually turned over to the Army, which fined them for "conduct unbecoming a soldier or an officer." The usual fine in one Army town a few years ago for an officer was \$151.50, and a similar fine was paid to the Army. At one post where I served, soldiers were told officially that they should let their wives drive, for

a wife could be fined only once—as a civilian.

When I was on my fourth tour of duty at Fort Benning, in 1956, about 9,000 families were living off-post. Many families lived in slums. Some used outdoor privies. Others shared bathrooms and kitchens, and slept in shifts because there were not enough bedrooms to go around. Finally, the Government authorized the Army to build 4,000 homes. But members of an area real estate board complained to Washington that the building of so many homes would ruin the local housing market. The authorization was cut down to 1,000 homes. The Army consistently caves in when challenged by local political-pressure groups.

Most civilians think that a soldier's pay is tax free, that he is financially coddled with extras that more than make up for his low pay. Soldiers do pay Federal income taxes and social security, regardless of where they are stationed in the world. They pay a 3-percent tax on food in all military commissaries. They also pay sales taxes where there are such taxes. The post exchange is highly overrated as a place for bargains. In many cases a soldier can buy goods cheaper at an off-post discount store. PX prices are deliberately pegged high enough to prevent area civilian merchants from suffering.

On-post Government housing is not free, and it certainly is not cheap. For example, at my last post, in a Government-owned housing project, I paid \$145.05 a month for a small two-bedroom apartment. My next-door neighbor paid \$175 a month for an identical apartment because he happened to be a colonel; I was a major.

Financially, the professional soldier is a second-class Federal employee. Until the cynically timed election-year pay raise recently voted by Congress, the pay of second lieutenants with less than 2 years' service had not been raised since 1958. The starting salary for a married second lieutenant, including all benefits, was about \$4,500 a year. The average, new, Government civilian employee starts at \$5,400. The civilian works a 40-hour week and is eligible for overtime pay. The soldier puts in a work week of 50 or more hours; even a 65-hour work week is not unusual. Of course, there is no overtime.

I am not suggesting that soldiering should be a 9-to-5 job with weekends and holidays off. A soldier is a soldier. It is a tough, demanding profession, and it has to be that way. As noncivilians, soldiers do not have many civilian rights. No civilian can be arrested for refusing to show up in his office or factory on a day he does not feel like working. A soldier can be court-martialed. The Army, rightfully, insists on extraordinary power over its men. The Army's mission is to defend the Nation, and to carry out this mission the rights of the Army must transcend the rights of the individual. No good soldier disputes this. And, in giving up rights guaranteed to all other U.S. citizens, no soldier expects extra privileges. This is in keeping with a fine American tradition that contrasts sharply with that of more militaristic nations.

America's long and unbroken tradition as a nonmilitaristic nation is not being questioned by the military men who serve this Nation. They do not want more recognition or more power. They simply want a more equitable share of that American way of life they hear so much about. Their demand is not merely for better pay and benefits; they are asking for a realistic attitude toward the military.

From the military man's point of view, the society he guards is unable to make up its mind. The American society demands a first-class Military Establishment. Yet, by keeping military pay scales low, by seemingly equating a military career with low-status employment, this same society makes it dif-



fault for dedicated men to enter, and stay in, military service.

Rather than a savior of his country, the American fighting man is looked upon as a parasite of an affluent peacetime society. From Congressmen on down, Americans have refused to look realistically at what brushfire wars like Vietnam mean to the soldier who has to fight, and perhaps die, in them. The soldier is willing to fight and die, but he has a right to ask that he be treated as a first-class citizen.

It is nothing less than immoral for the American public, through its political and military leaders, to perpetuate a policy of deception and distrust toward the serviceman. Today's victim of this policy is lured into a military career by appeals to his patriotism—and promises of security that are callously broken. I resigned from the Army because I sought a new and more satisfying way of life. I wanted security for myself and my family. I found little of the security the Army had led me to expect. The Army told me, in a pamphlet promoting the Army as a career, that the Army was striving to stabilize duty assignments, improve family stability, increase career attractiveness. The pamphlet emphasized what was supposed to be a basic Army policy: "The normal tour of duty will be for 3 years." In 13 years I moved 33 times, including 10 times in 9 years of marriage. And my experience was typical; I was a victim of the system.

The supreme irony comes when a man, with sorrow and reluctance, finally decides to resign from the Army. The same civilians who thought him foolish for joining the Army now look on him as foolish for resigning. They eye his rows of ribbons; they see a man of experience and valor withdrawing from their defense. They seem to sense that his absence is a chink in their armor. Perhaps they feel less secure.

In the year ending last June 30, a total of 1,483 regular officers resigned from all the armed services. The total was 1,622 in 1962 and 787 in 1961. The Nation cannot afford to lose these dedicated men. Nor can the Nation continue to believe it is possible to maintain a large Military Establishment whose members merely subsist on the fringes of the society they protect. Thousands of the men who guard America are raising families on incomes at or below the Government's own definition of a "poverty income."

If American civilians want the security provided by a large military establishment, they must provide more security to the men in that establishment. These men are not hired gunslingers; most of them are husbands and fathers with families to support. These men would die for their Nation, and these families would mourn them with pride. These Americans are among our finest. And our finest should be nothing less than cherished.

When I decided to resign from the Army, I wrote a letter to myself to justify my decision. I want the opportunity, I wrote, to grow personally and financially, according to my own ability; I want to be part of a stable community; I want a home; but mostly I want my children to grow up in an atmosphere which will more adequately prepare them to face the future with confidence. The U.S. Army does not offer these possibilities to me.

Now that I am a civilian, and proud of my military service and the U.S. Army, perhaps I should change that last sentence. For I know now that the Army was not alone in letting me down. America did too.

#### CHANGE IN OUR COINAGE SYSTEM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, during this next Congress no doubt there will be a change in our coinage system. The basic reason for this need for legislation is because of the great demand for silver. The short supply of silver and the present worldwide uses thereof exceed the 400 million ounces per year, of which the United States uses nearly 250 million ounces per year.

The worldwide supply of silver is slightly over 200 million ounces, 50 percent of world consumption.

The U.S. production of silver is less than 40 million ounces per year; less than 17 percent of our own demand.

The shortage of silver is supplied by sales from the U.S. Treasury at \$1.29 per ounce.

In January 1964 the Treasury had 1.53 billion ounces of silver.

In January 1965 the Treasury had 1.19 billion ounces—a loss of 340 million ounces of silver, during the last calendar year.

At this rate of loss the Treasury will run out of silver within 3 years.

The U.S. and Treasury supply of silver is already below the critical point.

We need at least 500 million ounces in strategic reserve, for space exploration, for photographic uses, for electrical contacts, brazing alloys, for monetary needs, and for shoring up friendly countries' currencies, as past examples in China and India prove.

At present the coinage demand alone in the United States is nearly 200 million ounces per year.

You have heard a great deal about the coin shortage. I suggest that the coinage shortage is not due to a lack of silver supply, but to lack of minting facilities, coin hoarding, and increased demand from vending machines. Over \$3 billion in sales were made by vending machines in 1964.

If the laws of supply and demand were allowed free play, the price of silver on the world market today would be in excess of \$1.29 an ounce. If it were not for the Treasury Department selling at that price, the price of silver would be much higher.

If our present Treasury stocks are depleted, the Treasury would not have silver to sell at \$1.29 per ounce and the world market price would be so great that it would be profitable to melt down our coins. During 1942 and 1943 we minted silver nickels, which at the present price of silver, are worth seven cents. There are in the United States today two firms refining these nickels for the silver they contain; one in the State of New York, the other in the State of Utah.

It is evident that the Treasury must maintain the \$1.29 per ounce price until we change our coinage system. The Treasury Department has finally recog-

nized this, and is attempting to come up with an answer. It has a private organization conducting a research program with regard to the coinage problems and its report was to have been made in December, then in January, then on February 1, and it may be the month of April before we receive it.

At the present time there is considerable sentiment within the Treasury Department to completely debase our coins and to substitute cupro-nickel, or some other base metal, for silver. I think this would be to the detriment of the United States. We have at present in silver stocks, 1.19 billion ounces of silver stored at West Point, which could be used as a coinage reserve for some considerable time. I believe that by reducing the silver content of our coins, we could provide a coinage of intrinsic value, and one that would meet the needs of vending machines. At the same time, this procedure would provide coinage acceptable in the United States, maintain the prestige of our coins throughout the world, and keep the dollar respected wherever it is traded.

This morning I viewed a TV program on which an official of the Treasury Department was interviewed. He indicated a possible complete debasement of our coinage. Not long ago, there appeared a comic strip in the Washington Post showing a need for coinage debasement. The strip suggested that we would have paper money, such as shinplasters, as they were called in the 1830's, and 1840's, in the place of our present silver coins.

I think the West has a vital interest in this matter, but my interest arises, not just because I come from a Western State. If I were from the State of Florida, I would be just as interested in the integrity of our coinage.

Most of the silver produced in the United States is mined as a byproduct. Our copper, lead, zinc, and other metal mines interestingly extract ores that contain silver as an impurity. I do not think that with the maintenance of the \$1.29 per ounce price, these mines will produce additional amounts of silver, the need for which is evident.

The need for a change in our silver policy and coinage system has been, after years of warnings by the Congress, recognized by the Treasury Department. At present, a study within the Department is underway. A private firm has been engaged to explore the metallurgical possibilities for coinage changes. Even before the results of these studies have been established, the opponents of silver coinage within the Treasury Department are voicing the hopes of the Silver Users Association by stating that the future coins of the United States will contain no silver.

The critical coin shortage is related in the silver opponents' statements to the silver shortage, when, in fact, there is no direct connection between the two. The coin shortage is due to inadequate mint facilities, increasing populations, greatly expanded sales through vending machines—approximately \$3 billion in 1964—and coin hoarding, as I said before. The credibility of the study will



be in doubt due to the preconceived notions within the Treasury, and the manner in which some of its officials are waging a campaign against silver.

Even if those persons within the Treasury Department who have a historic dislike for silver coins prevail in the report of that Department, the ultimate decision is that of the Congress. The Constitution explicitly imposes the responsibility for coining money and the regulation of its value upon the Congress. We surely will enact legislation affecting coinage this year, and it is my hope that we will provide coins befitting the dignity of this country. In short, I believe we must retain silver in our coinage system, not only for the intrinsic value for such coinage, but also to properly fit the commerce of the United States. A reduction in the present silver content will alleviate the silver shortage problem, and will maintain a coin of prestige of our Nation.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. First of all, I want to compliment the gentleman from Idaho for bringing this subject to the floor of the House today because I think it is very vital to a sound dollar and sound coins in this country. But I want to ask more specifically if you can give us any figure or any source of figures to justify the statement that there is a loss of silver from the storage in West Point.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I would say that the daily statement of the U.S. Treasury at the beginning of 1963 showed more than 1,650 million ounces of silver were in storage at West Point and the one I received just yesterday showed 1,191 million ounces or a net loss of almost 600 million ounces during the last year and one-half.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. All of that 600 million ounces did not go into coinage then?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. It did not, but a great amount went into coinage and a lot of it was sold, or redeemed as the Treasury Department likes to say, for silver certificates when they were presented at the assay offices in New York and San Francisco.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Is the Treasury Department just redeeming silver certificates or are they actually selling silver to silver users such as jewelers and photographic industry and then, in turn, going out and soliciting the silver certificates to come in.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I think you would find that at first the administrative procedure was that the Treasury would collect silver certificates and would provide them to anyone desiring to convert them to silver for any acceptable credit. But they changed this through notification in the Federal Register so that the redeemer must collect his own silver certificates. But I think this could be arranged very easily through a Federal Reserve bank. The bank collects the silver certificates, and exchanges them for Federal Reserve notes. The purchaser can then exchange his sil-

ver certificates for silver at the assay office.

This silver then finds its way into industrial uses as well as into the hands of speculators now hoarding silver.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Obviously, then a great amount of silver is being diverted from coinage directly by going to various silver manufacturers.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. That is correct. I believe you will find also certain of our coins find their way into other nations of the world through the tourist trade and are being diverted directly into industrial uses by being melted down. In Canada, I have been told that some of our coinage which enters Canada is melted down for silver solder; it being more economical than buying the copper and the silver separately then alloying them.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Obviously then the price of only \$1.29 an ounce or the value of \$1.29 an ounce is not a very realistic one.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. It very definitely is not.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. And there should be a very much higher price or a higher value placed on each ounce of silver otherwise we are going to lose silver to the whole world; are we not?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I will say to the gentleman from Montana, I agree that the pressure for a higher price for silver is due to the fact that we have a deficiency of 200 million ounces a year. In other words, we are providing one-half of the silver demands of the free world out of Treasury stocks.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. In effect, we are subsidizing silver users not only in the United States but all over the world by putting silver out at a price of \$1.29 an ounce.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. And when you say, "we" that means the taxpayers of the United States selling millions of ounces of silver at a certain price when it should be sold through a price established by supply and demand. Then the taxpayers of the United States would benefit from any profit that would accrue from the sale of such silver rather than subsidizing users of this silver or the speculators.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. It is not only an injustice to the taxpayers of the United States but it is an injustice to the silver miners and the other metal miners because they, in turn, are not able to get the right price for their silver in competition with this cheap silver coming out of the Treasury.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. That is correct. They are in direct competition with the miner. He should be a beneficiary of this higher price which would be in effect if the law of supply and demand were allowed to exercise itself.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I thank the gentleman from Idaho again for bringing this matter to the floor of the House.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I commend my distinguished and able colleague from Idaho for bringing this to the attention

of the House today, for bringing it to the attention of Congress and to the attention of the people of this country.

I do not have a silver mine in my State, nor is there a copper, a nickel, or a zinc mine, nor a mine of any of these metals, but I can foresee a time when our currency may be depreciated and possibly wrecked.

I do not wish to see paper money substituted for 50-cent pieces or 25-cent pieces or dimes. I want to see the coinage continued.

I do not want to see the taxpayers defrauded.

I commend the gentleman. This is an urgent matter. It is very important to this Congress and to the people of this country. I pledge the gentleman my support, though I come from an area which is not directly concerned with mining at all. I am concerned.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I thank the gentleman. I would suggest to those who are listening that the name of the gentleman from South Carolina who just spoke, WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, is qualified in many ways, particularly in name, to make his comments.

I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I wish to commend my colleague from Idaho for bringing this matter before the House. Members will recall that in the last session, when we had the proposition brought before us to get rid of silver certificates, the gentleman in the well of the House led the fight against that action. I believe the country is now realizing that Congress then made a mistake.

The gentleman from Idaho is one of the best informed persons in the United States on these matters it has been my pleasure to know. I commend him, and I commend the speech he is making to all Members of the House.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

At the present time, I am preparing legislation, which would require that the silver content of our coins be reduced. The bill will have a lower limit, or "not less than" provision for the percentage of silver to be contained in our future coins. The bill would permit the Secretary of the Treasury to adjust the silver content between the present number of grains and approximately one-third that amount. Discretion would be given to the Secretary regarding the time and manner of the adjustment, in order to preserve the outstanding coinage.

There are seven distinct advantages to the policy I propose:

First. The United States would preserve a coinage of intrinsic value. It is important for the world's economic, military, political, and cultural leader to maintain a prestige coinage. Other nations have reduced or eliminated silver from some or all of their coins, but those of the greatest stability recognize the necessity for providing silver content coins for their citizens.



I have in my possession a 5-franc piece from Switzerland which is about 85 percent fine. I have in my possession coins from Italy. Despite all the talk about the coins from Italy, they still have some coins in circulation which are about 85 percent fine, like the 500-lire piece. Even in Great Britain there is the florin, or the 2-shilling piece, which contains 50 percent silver.

It would be a great blow to our international standing if the United States adopted a token coinage system.

Second. The threat to the present coinage from commercial melting would be eliminated. An interim step that the Secretary might use would be to revalue all the present coins, so that they would be more valuable in purchasing power than for industrial use.

Third. Reduction of the silver content in the coins, by definition, increases the monetary value of the 1 billion ounces of silver owned by the Treasury. The benefit of doubling or tripling the value of any asset is obvious.

Fourth. The present ceiling of \$1.29 per ounce for silver not only discourages production but prevents a fair return to the miners of this metal. An increase in the monetary value of silver would allow the market price of silver to seek its true level and certainly would stimulate production, so that supply and demand could be brought into line.

Fifth. Continuance of a silver coinage would continue to prevent coin counterfeiting. A token coinage would be easy to counterfeit and the cost of materials would be such that it would be profitable.

Sixth. The increased monetary value of silver held by the Treasury would allow the issuance of more silver certificates, thus relieving the increasing pressure for higher interest rates. The substitution of Federal Reserve notes for silver certificates created a demand for more credit. The pressure on our gold reserve by issuance of more Federal Reserve notes was increased. Through the use of higher value silver to back silver certificates, the need for 25 percent gold backing and 75 percent U.S. credits on Federal Reserve notes would be alleviated.

Seventh. Silver has a much higher electrical conductivity than any base metal. The vending machine industry, which had gross sales of over \$3 billion in 1964, relies upon this conductivity for its sophisticated rejection devices. No substitute metal or alloy has been found which would work in these rejection devices. The preservation of silver in our coins would allow this American vending machine industry to grow according to the demands of the American public. If base metal coins were substituted, havoc would result for the vending machine owners.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened to many recommendations in the past from the Treasury Department with respect to coinage. As you will recall, in the last session of the 88th Congress there was included in an appropriation bill for the Treasury Department a provision to mint 45 million additional silver dollars. It would seem a Member from the State of Idaho, where silver dollars are in general

circulation, would be in favor of such an appropriation to cover the minting of additional silver dollars.

However, realizing that the silver dollars which would be minted would immediately be following the same path of millions of other silver dollars that we had in the Treasury at the beginning of last year, which disappeared into the corners and into the hands of coin collectors, realizing that they would go the same way, I therefore opposed that proposition at that time.

The appropriation bill we passed would have used 38 million ounces of silver and would have cost the taxpayers \$600,000 in minting costs.

Now I would like to read to you a letter written by Mr. Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, to Mr. Gary, who was then the chairman of the Subcommittee on Treasury Appropriations, who carried the conference report here in the House of Representatives. I will not read the entire letter, but I would like to read from it some of the things that were said by Mr. Dillon, the Secretary of the Treasury, as reasons for minting the silver dollars and the general effects it might have:

Also, use of the silver dollar will, to a great extent in the West at least, alleviate the heavy demands we have had on the quarter and 50-cent pieces.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand how Mr. Dillon could say that the minting of silver dollars would relieve the demands on quarters and 50-cent pieces.

He also said at this time:

Under this program we are acquiring many presses from the Department of Defense, GSA, and private industry and converting them for emergency use, although they will not be suitable nor economical on a long-range basis. With these presses now, however, and the continued purchase of bronze and nickel strip, we will be able to produce the 45 million silver dollars without cutting down on the production of coin of smaller denominations.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the Members of the House that they might check the recent press in general circulation in Washington, D.C., and note where Secretary Dillon has said that it would be improper to mint the silver dollars and that they were going to hold this minting production in abeyance.

Mr. Speaker, in view of type of information emanating from the Treasury Department with respect to coinage in the case of the silver dollar, I do not see how we can depend upon information coming from them regarding other coins.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that the gentlemen in the Treasury Department have an immense problem. I have attempted in the course of the past 2 years in this Congress to try to point out the problem to the Members of this body and hoped that some officials in the Treasury Department might have at least referred to some of the things that were said on this floor.

Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago I attempted to preclude the possibility of the demonetization of silver; that is, the removal of silver certificates. At the same time I asked that we increase the monetary price of silver so that we could maintain

silver dollars and silver certificates, which are kept in circulation without additional cost to the taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I have prepared legislation for the Congress' consideration which I hope will provide the things which I have suggested here today.

We will also have to consider the possibility of a strategic reserve of silver, because the pressure today from the industrial users of silver is as great as the coinage demand.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, permit me to say to the gentleman from Idaho that I share his concern about silver reserves and the silver contained in our coins. In fact I share the concern of many others about the overall matter of silver. This is something which is very vital to the security and stability of our coinage system and to our entire monetary system. We must not make the monetary system suspect.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to assure the gentleman from Idaho that I shall work with him and others here in the Congress this year in an effort to try to achieve some satisfactory solution to this problem.

I appreciate the gentleman bringing this matter to the attention of the Members of the House today.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for his comments.

I am hopeful that the legislation, which I will soon introduce, will receive favorable consideration from the Committee on Banking and Currency that we will have an opportunity to consider it here on the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I shall endeavor to keep the Congress informed of my activities in this area. My only purpose in so doing is to maintain an adequate coinage for the United States and at the same time provide the necessary backing for the currency in such manner as to be economical to the taxpayers of the country and to the people in general.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to compliment the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] and to assure him of the sincere interest of virtually all of my constituents in the State of Wyoming in this matter. I further wish to assure the gentleman of my unqualified support in an effort to bring about the preservation of this institution, silver coins, to the people of my State of Wyoming.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I thank the gentleman from Wyoming.

#### THE QUESTION OF CYPRUS SHOULD BE PLACED ON THE AGENDA OF THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 10 minutes.



Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission today to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a series of documents prepared by His Excellency Zenon Rossides, permanent representative of Cyprus to the United Nations, in support of his Government's formal request to the United Nations that the question of Cyprus be included as a supplementary item in the agenda of the 19th session.

It is my firm conviction that the excellent presentation made by Ambassador Rossides deserves the most earnest attention of our own State Department and those Americans who earnestly hope for justice for Cyprus.

It is regrettable that the excellent arguments set forth by the Cyprus Government have not received wider attention in the United States and the rest of the free world.

I have recently introduced a resolution which calls for free elections on the island of Cyprus to help, once and for all, resolve the problem of administration for this very important bastion of freedom in the Mediterranean.

One has a right to ask why the voices of those who proclaim most loudly their support for the doctrine of self-determination, appear to be conspicuously silent on this whole question of self-determination for Cyprus.

It is interesting that in the United Nations the very newly emerging nations which seem to be most concerned about the survival of self-determination in their own republics, are conspicuously silent on the question of giving the same principles of self-determination to the people of Cyprus.

It is proper, Mr. Speaker, that we ask in this assembly whether the United States itself has a double standard of justice dealing with the entire principle of self-determination. I have not seen the same degree of enthusiasm voiced in behalf of the Cypriots as we hear in behalf of many other nations, some with much shorter traditions of self-government.

Mr. Speaker, I am fully aware of the difficult position which confronts the free world in resolving the Cypriot problem. But then, Mr. Speaker, the tangled affairs of the entire world present many difficult problems. I do not believe that we should fail to remain resolute in demanding self-determination for Cyprus, when we have taken a very strong position on this principle in so many other parts of the world.

There is no easy solution to the problem of Cyprus but the free world only compounds the complexity of this issue by failing to push resolutely for self-determination.

Ambassador Rossides makes out an excellent case for the people of Cyprus, and it would be my hope that at least our Government will have the courage

to support the compelling logic of Ambassador Rossides' presentation.

This question must be placed on the agenda of the 19th session of the United Nations General Assembly this year.

Ambassador Rossides' excellent analysis follows:

THE JUSTICE FOR CYPRUS COMMITTEE REPRINT OF "QUESTION OF CYPRUS" BEFORE THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY, DECEMBER 4, 1964, AND OTHER RELATED DOCUMENTS

(Compiled by the Justice for Cyprus Committee, Chicago, Ill.)

[United Nations General Assembly, 19th session]

REQUEST FOR THE INCLUSION OF A SUPPLEMENTARY ITEM IN THE AGENDA OF THE 19TH SESSION: QUESTION OF CYPRUS

(Letter dated December 4, 1964, from the permanent representative of Cyprus to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General.)

Further to my letter dated September 25, 1964,<sup>1</sup> whereby I requested, on behalf of my Government, that the item entitled "Question of Cyprus" be included in the agenda of the forthcoming 19th regular session of the General Assembly as a supplementary item, I have the honor to furnish here below the text of the explanatory memorandum in relation thereto, in accordance with rule 20 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

ZENON ROSSIDES,

Permanent Representative of Cyprus to the United Nations.

#### EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM

1. The problem of Cyprus appears exceedingly complicated and involved, but in essence it is very simple. It stems from a virtual denial to the people of Cyprus of its fundamental right to self-determination and from an effort to deprive the Republic of Cyprus of the substance of its sovereignty and independence.

2. Since the establishment of the United Nations, 49 new countries emerged to independence and joined the organization. For all, except Cyprus, the right of self-determination under the charter was applied. For all, except Cyprus, the structure of the external and internal independence of the country conformed with the universally accepted democratic principles of majority decision and majority rule. Hence the regrettable situation in Cyprus threatening world peace. Its origins lie in the colonial policy of divide and rule, in the name of which Turkey was in 1955 unjustifiably encouraged to inject itself in the affairs of Cyprus. It did so with the aim of provoking intercommunal division and strife in Cyprus in order to serve neocolonialist purposes alien to the interests of the Cypriot people, whether of Turkish or Greek origin.

3. The General Assembly in its declaration against colonialism, adopted in 1960, declared that all peoples have the inalienable right to complete freedom and self-determination, the exercise of their sovereignty and the integrity of their national territory. It declared that transfer of all powers to the peoples of colonial territories should be "without any conditions or reservations, in accordance with their freely expressed will and desire \* \* \* in order to enable them to enjoy complete independence and freedom."

4. In the case of Cyprus, however, such encumbrances were attached to its independence as purported to prevent it from enjoying the full independence and freedom to which it was entitled. This situation was

created by the Zurich and London agreements of 1959. They provided for a basic constitution for the retention by the United Kingdom of two areas as sovereign military bases, and for two other treaties. A treaty of guarantee with Greece, Turkey, and the United Kingdom as the guarantor powers, and a treaty of alliance between Cyprus, Greece and Turkey.

5. These agreements, which were concluded while Cyprus was still a colony, were not the result of the free consent of the Cypriot people. They were imposed upon them from outside with a pressure that under the prevailing circumstances at the time left no possibility of choice for the Cypriot leadership. Rejection of the agreements would have meant denial of independence, continuation of colonial rule, and increased bloodshed.

6. Cyprus was declared an independent state as the Republic of Cyprus by act of the British Parliament of August 16, 1960. Under the aforesaid agreements the basic constitutional structure, abnormal in its nature, proved in practice wholly unworkable. It created unprecedented conditions of imbalance by subjecting the majority of the 82 percent to the minority of 18 percent and through its sharply divisive built-in provisions led to antagonism and trouble in the island. A striking example of the paralyzing veto power granted to the minority is the unreasonable requirement of separate Turkish Cypriot majority for any legislation on taxation. Thus, in a House of Representatives of 50 members (of whom 35 Greek and 15 Turkish Cypriots), 8 Turkish Cypriot votes could prevent the passage of any fiscal measure, even though the remaining 42 votes were in favor. This unprecedented arrangement is contrary to all accepted norms of democratic government. By the exercise, and indeed the abuse, of this right, a small Turkish Cypriot minority defeated the passing of the main fiscal legislation, thus blocking the normal functioning of the state.

7. The people of Cyprus, who were never given the opportunity to discuss the basic structure of their constitution, were deprived even of the possibility to amend it, in any of its details of internal administration without the consent of three outside countries.

8. The treaty of guarantee purported to give three other states, Turkey, Greece, and the United Kingdom, the power to interfere in the domestic affairs of Cyprus and in its internal administration. The unprecedented constitutional encumbrances, interlocked with the aforementioned treaties, were in effect intended to rob Cyprus of the very substance of its sovereignty and its internal independence and to place it under the tutelage of three foreign powers.

9. On September 20, 1960, Cyprus was admitted to the United Nations as a sovereign and equal member of the organization. This admission was unanimous and without any reservation. By virtue of it, the rights of equal sovereignty, full independence, and territorial integrity attaching to membership in the United Nations were, in effect, fully recognized to Cyprus. This reality can neither be denied nor ignored. All states members of the United Nations, including the signatories of the aforementioned treaties, have a responsibility under the charter to respect the aforesaid rights of the Republic of Cyprus. The treaty of guarantee comes into direct conflict with the principles and specific provisions of the charter. This conflict was brought into sharper focus through the actions of one of the signatories, Turkey, who, on a pretended right from that treaty, resorted to threats and acts of aggression against Cyprus.

10. In carrying out such policy of force and violence, Turkey raided Cyprus by air, killing



and maiming hundreds of innocent men, women, and children, in an attack of terror including the use of napalm incendiary bombs—all this by using the treaty of guarantee as an excuse. Such flagrant violation of the charter, however, could not be sanctioned by any treaty, particularly having regard to article 103 of the charter.

11. The other imposed treaty, the treaty of alliance, ostensibly concluded for the purpose of defending Cyprus against outside aggression, has actually been used by a supposed ally as an instrument of aggression, and has thus been repeatedly and continuously violated by Turkey. The Turkish troops which were stationed in Cyprus under the said treaty, instead of remaining in their allocated base as those of an ally under tripartite command, have been and still are arbitrarily deployed in hostile occupation of Cypriot territory, thereby committing continuing aggression.

12. The underlying cause for the divisive policy and hostile actions by Turkey was its aim to force partition of the island, thereby also promoting neocolonialism. In furtherance of this policy, the extremist Turkish Cypriot leadership was incited to rebellion by Ankara. This attempt to disrupt the state was calculated to cause conditions which would justify invasion by Turkey under the right allegedly contained in the treaty of guarantee. The objective was to advance the aforesaid aim of partition by intensifying division.

13. In the past 11 months, Turkey has constantly and repeatedly threatened armed intervention in Cyprus, notably on December 27, 1963, and March 13, 1964. Its plans to invade the island were thwarted by the timely recourse of the Government of Cyprus to the United Nations Security Council.

14. The Security Council, in its capacity as the organ entrusted under the charter with the primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security, has dealt with certain specific aspects of the problem confronting Cyprus in respect of the threats of outside aggression and their internal repercussions on the basis of the complaint of the Government of Cyprus against the Government of Turkey for "acts of aggression and intervention in the internal affairs of Cyprus by the threat and use of force against its territorial integrity and political independence" (letter dated December 26, 1963, from the permanent representative of Cyprus addressed to the President of the Security Council, document S/5488 and subsequent communications). The Security Council has adopted interim measure intended to achieve pacification and normalization of the situation in Cyprus.

15. The Government of Cyprus has repeatedly declared its readiness to insure full respect for the human rights of all citizens in accordance with the universal declaration of human rights and to agree to international safeguards for the protection of the legitimate rights of minorities. In this connection the Government of Cyprus is prepared to accept United Nations observation in respect of the implementation of the above rights.

16. The Republic of Cyprus, an equal member of the United Nations, looks to the General Assembly to uphold its unrestricted and unfettered sovereignty and independence, thereby allowing its people to determine freely, and without any foreign intervention or interference, the political future of the country, in accordance with the charter of the organization. In this spirit the General Assembly is expected to call upon all states, in conformity with their obligations under the Charter of the United Nations, and in particular article 2, paragraphs 1 and 4, to respect the sovereignty, unity, independence,

and territorial integrity of Cyprus and to refrain from any threat or use of force or intervention directed against Cyprus.

#### EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM BY AMBASSADOR ROSSIDES

Cyprus appealed to the General Assembly to uphold the "unrestricted and unfettered sovereignty and independence" of the island. The appeal came in a memorandum from Mr. Zenon Rossides, the permanent representative of Cyprus to the United Nations, explaining his country's request that the question of Cyprus be placed on the General Assembly's agenda.

Mr. Rossides said that Cyprus "looks to the General Assembly to uphold its unfettered sovereignty and independence, thereby allowing its people to determine freely, and without any foreign intervention or interference, the political future of the country." His letter, addressed to Secretary-General U Thant, called on the Assembly to urge "all states" to respect the "sovereignty, unity, independence, and territorial integrity of Cyprus and to refrain from any threat or use of force or intervention directed against Cyprus."

Turkey, had "constantly and repeatedly threatened armed intervention," had carried out air raids "killing and maiming hundreds of innocent men, women, and children," and had deployed its forces "in hostile occupation of Cypriot territory." In essence, the problem of Cyprus was simple, Mr. Rossides said. It stemmed from a "virtual denial to the people of Cyprus of its fundamental right to self-determination and from an effort to deprive the Republic of Cyprus of its sovereignty and independence." The treaty of guarantee and the treaty of alliance, which established Cyprus Constitution and its relations with Turkey, Greece, and Britain, were imposed from outside, he said. The Constitution was "abnormal in its nature" and "wholly unworkable" in practice because it gave a "paralyzing veto power" to the Turkish minority on the island. Eight Turkish Cypriot votes in the House of Representatives could prevent the passage of any fiscal measure, he said. The arrangement was unprecedented as "contrary to all accepted norms of democratic government."

The treaty of guarantee purported to give Turkey, Greece, and Britain the unprecedented constitutional right to interfere in internal Cyprus affairs. It was intended to rob Cyprus of the very substance of its sovereignty, Mr. Rossides said. The treaty came into direct conflict with the Charter of the United Nations, under which Cyprus was admitted as a sovereign and equal member state, he added.

The treaty of alliance, ostensibly concluded for the purpose of defending Cyprus against outside aggression, has actually been used by a supposed ally as an instrument of aggression and has thus been repeatedly and continuously violated by Turkey. Turkish troops on the island were committing continuing aggression, Mr. Rossides said.

Turkey's divisive policy and hostile actions were aimed at forcing partition of the island, and the extremist Turkish Cypriot leadership had been incited by Ankara authorities to rebel for this reason, he added. The Nicosia government had repeatedly declared its readiness to insure full respect for the human rights of all citizens in accordance with the universal declaration of human rights and was prepared to accept United Nations observers who could see that this guarantee was carried out, he said.

#### UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.

The enclosed communication dated December 15, 1964, is transmitted to the permanent missions of the states members of the United Nations at the request of the permanent

representative of Cyprus to the United Nations.

DECEMBER 15, 1964.

PERMANENT MISSION OF THE  
REPUBLIC OF CYPRUS,  
TO THE UNITED NATIONS,  
New York, N.Y., December 15, 1964.

His Excellency U THANT,  
Secretary General United Nations,  
New York, N.Y.

EXCELLENCY: The reply of the permanent representative of Turkey of December 4 (S/6083) to my communication of November 24 (P.O. 210. Cyp.) makes it obvious that the policy of his government continues to be one of division, disruption, and conflict in Cyprus. This is regrettable.

Mr. Eralp is unable to conceal his disappointment that for over 2 months now complete calm prevails in Cyprus. He opposes all steps taken toward normality and peaceful living between Greek and Turkish Cypriots; he resents the return of judicial order through the establishment of integrated courts of law, now functioning satisfactorily all over the island, with Greek and Turkish judges fully cooperating and impartially administering justice without any racial or ethnic discrimination; he bypasses the significant progress toward good will by the Government of Cyprus; he tries to ignore all other constructive steps taken by the Cypriot Government, with the cooperation of UNFICYP, as concretely enumerated in my letter.

Mr. Eralp, furthermore, passes in complete silence a main premise of my said communication; namely, the irrefutable documentary evidence, therein reproduced, which he could not deny and which proves the terrorism still exercised by the extremist Turkish leadership against thousands of Turkish Cypriot citizens, forcing upon them compulsory segregation, in an effort to keep up division and strife and to hinder the return to peaceful and normal life. Nor could he deny the most recent instance of such terrorism reported in my said letter; namely, that of the killing of Hassan Hussein alias Kivatch, who was shot by Turkish terrorists in the presence of his wife and children, merely because he wanted to escape captivity and return to his village. The numerous appeals made by such victims to the moderate Turkish leader, Dr. Tansu Ali, and the latter's relevant communications to the Secretary General and the UNFICYP commander, in an effort to relieve the suffering of his fellow Turks from terrorist captivity, are an impressive piece of evidence that cannot be wiped out by Mr. Eralp describing Dr. Ali as a turncoat, presumably for not supporting terrorism.

While taking such negative attitude, Ambassador Eralp finds no difficulty to complain that the Government of Cyprus does not open its doors to Dr. Kutchuk and his rebellious set, so that they may be able to pursue from within their nefarious work of disrupting the state.

It is, moreover, significant that in purporting to reply to my letter of November 24, which dealt in a spirit of positiveness with developments of the last two months, the Turkish representative prefers to speak of the preceding period, nostalgically reverting to its strife and recrimination by dwelling on controversies exhaustively dealt with at the time. He even goes back 8 years and tries to distort the historic reality that during the independence struggle Turkish Cypriots, instigated by Ankara and acting as the agents of divisive colonialism, were opposing by force the fight for freedom, and in the process were engaged in indiscriminate attacks against the Greek Cypriots, killing, burning, and looting, in order to bring confusion and a setback to the liberation movement.



Similarly, with the aim now of depriving the Republic of the substance of its independence, the same policy is followed by Turkey, for whom division and strife in Cyprus has become an objective in itself, as a means toward the hopelessness of partition with an eye to annexation.

I cannot help saying that it is this divisive and expansionist policy, so far pursued by Turkey in the service of neocolonialism and in violation of the United Nations Charter, that has been, and continues to be, the cause of the whole trouble in the area. Through its menace to the territorial integrity, the sovereignty and the independence of Cyprus, it constitutes a threat to international peace and security.

We hope and trust that, with the help of the United Nations, reasonableness may prevail, so that enduring peace may come to Cyprus through a just and democratic solution of its problem.

Your Excellency is kindly requested to have this letter circulated to all member states.

Please accept, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

ZENON ROSSIDES,  
Permanent Representative of Cyprus to  
the United Nations.

#### NATIONAL HUMANITIES FOUNDATION

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to represent a district which includes some of the great academic institutions of this Nation. This is a wonderful distinction, for no one can doubt the role of intellect in our national life.

In the education of the whole man, the role of humanities is supreme. The legislation which I am introducing today proposes the establishment of a National Humanities Foundation to promote progress in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes.

The legislation is based on the report of the Commission on the Humanities produced under the sponsorship of the American Council of Learned Societies, the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, and the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa.

Suffice it to say at this time, I am immensely proud to join a number of my distinguished colleagues in working for the enactment of this legislation.

#### CCC GRAIN DUMPING NEEDS HALTING

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which will

prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from selling food or feed grains at less than 120 percent of the current loan support price. In my judgment, it is one of the most urgently needed pieces of farm legislation which will come before this Congress. It may literally mean whether many of our hard-pressed farmers retain a toehold on the land, or whether they are swept into overcrowded cities already burdened with unemployment.

This legislation has been made necessary because of the flagrant dumping policies of the CCC. CCC dumping has disastrously dropped farm prices and created serious new problems for the livestock industry by encouraging overproduction of beef and hogs on cheap feed.

The seriousness of the CCC marketing manipulations cannot be overestimated. One out of every two farmers in America receives part of his income from wheat alone. Yet, during last year's harvest period, the CCC dumped 150 million bushels of wheat in competition with current crops.

The Grain Terminal Association of St. Paul, Minn., has estimated this action dropped wheat prices 20 cents a bushel. Thus, the experts tell us, some \$240 million were lost on last year's total crop of 1,200 million bushels.

I want to point out this sorry practice is not confined merely to wheat. It involves all the feed grains. As an example, Charles Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, has pointed out that the CCC dumped more than 1.6 billion bushels of corn from CCC stocks in the period 1961 through September 1, 1964.

The reason for the punitive approach of CCC has been, as every farmer knows, to try and force noncompliers into the Government support program for feed grains. Aside from the shaky ethics of this course, the punitive measures are a dismal failure.

Compliers as well as noncompliers have been hurt by a Department of Agriculture agency which should be working in the best interests of both. Nor did such antics assist appreciably in ridding the Government warehouses of excess grain stocks. On the contrary, prices at last year's harvest time fell so low, many farmers elected to put their crops under Government seal, thereby replacing what the Government had sold.

#### MASSIVE PUBLIC LAW 480 FOOD SHIPMENTS TO THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC SHOULD BE CUT OFF

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the recent attacks against U.S. interests and property by Egyptian President Nasser are without question a vindication of last year's effort by House Republicans

to cut off massive Public Law 480 food shipments to the United Arab Republic.

The State Department has continued to disregard congressional directives prohibiting U.S. foreign aid to aggressor nations.

In September 1964, many House Republicans attempted, almost successfully to remove Nasser's United Arab Republic from among those nations which receive surplus foods under the food for peace program—Public Law 480.

Certainly, administration policymakers must accept major responsibility for indirectly subsidizing Nasser's assistance to Communist rebels in the Congo; his war in Yemen involving an expeditionary force of at least 60,000 troops; his subversion in south Arabia; and his threats against U.S. airbases in Libya. Without our \$140-million-a-year food shipments, the time would be long since past when Nasser would have been forced to turn more of his attention to the pressing economic needs of his own people.

Under the terms of the 1963 Foreign Assistance Act, Congress directed the President to withhold all foreign economic aid and Public Law 480 aid from those nations committing aggressive acts against any other countries receiving our aid. This directive has been ignored in the case of Nasser's unprovoked war in Yemen and continues to be ignored in the face of Nasser's recent boasts concerning his role in the Congo massacres. Unless Nasser changes his tune, and changes it fast, Congress should overwhelmingly approve a rigid prohibition against further aid of any kind to the United Arab Republic.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert the following article from the New York Times in the RECORD:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Dec. 24, 1964]

NASSER, ANGERED BY CRITICISM, SAYS UNITED STATES CAN "JUMP IN LAKE"—ASSERTS CAIRO WOULD REFUSE AID RATHER THAN ACCEPT DICTATION OF POLICY

(By Hedrick Smith)

CAIRO, December 23.—President Gamal Abdel Nasser lashed back tonight at American criticism and delays on economic aid. He told the United States in Egyptian slang to "jump in the lake" if Washington disapproved of Cairo's recent behavior.

He also declared that the Egyptian people were ready to "cut our rations" and do without \$140 million in American aid rather than let the United States dictate Egyptian policy.

The President was replying to expressions of American irritation over the burning of the U.S. Embassy library in Cairo last month and the downing of an American oil company plane by Egyptian jets 4 days ago.

(In Washington, officials said that Mr. Nasser's attack could imperil the United Arab Republic's chances of receiving U.S. surplus food.)

The Egyptian leader accused the United States and Belgium of aggression in the Congo and rejected an appeal, reported to have been sent to him by President Johnson through diplomatic channels that Egypt stop sending arms to the Congolese rebels.

"Our policy is clear and we say it openly," Mr. Nasser told a cheering crowd at Victory Day celebrations at Port Said.

"We say that we sent arms to the Congolese people and we shall keep on sending arms to the Congo."

In his speech, which marked the anniversary of the departure of British troops from

Port Said after the invasion of Suez by British and French forces in 1956, Mr. Nasser chided the United States on its relationship with Iran. He referred to Iran as an "American colony subjected to American and Zionist influences."

He was apparently most provoked by what he called the U.S. Ambassador's refusal to discuss Egyptian requests for economic aid because of irritation over Cairo's handling of the library-burning and plane-downing incidents.

Mr. Nasser said that Ambassador Lucius D. Battle met yesterday with an Egyptian official, but "was so upset over Egyptian conduct, he stayed only 2 minutes."

The Egyptian leader said that if the Ambassador did not approve of Egyptian behavior, he could "drink from the sea."

"And if the Mediterranean Sea is not big enough," he went on, "we will give him the Red Sea to drink it, too."

Egyptians said that this was the equivalent of telling the Ambassador to "jump in the lake."

#### READY TO CUT RATIONS

Elsewhere in his speech, Mr. Nasser implied that the United States was trying to attach strings to its huge economic aid program.

"The Americans," he declared, "want to give us aid and dominate our policy. I say we are sorry. We are ready to cut our rations and minimize the daily consumption so that we keep our independence."

With a high-level Soviet delegation at his side, Mr. Nasser said that Egypt had received about 50 million Egyptian pounds, or \$115 million, in American wheat, meat, and chickens. But he scoffed at reports of serious food shortages in Egypt.

"If need be," he said of the American aid program, "we will save 50 million pounds. We do not want their money."

The bulk of American aid to Egypt is in the form of surplus food shipments under a 3-year agreement signed in 1962 that extends through next fall. The present dispute is over an extra \$35 million worth of corn, meat, and chickens that the Egyptian Government requested in September to help combat food shortages. U.S. officials have been drafting a response to that request.

Turning to the Congo question, Mr. Nasser compared the November 24 American-Belgian operation to rescue white hostages in Stanleyville to the British-French and Israeli attack on Egypt in 1956.

In the view of some experienced observers, Mr. Nasser's speech was the toughest anti-American position he had taken publicly since 1956 when the proposal for U.S. assistance for the Aswan High Dam fell through and Egypt turned to the Soviet Union for help.

#### LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the RECORD of this date an editorial from the United Mine Workers Journal, dated December 1, 1964.

My reason for presenting this to the House is to show the interest of the workers of our Nation in the measures sponsored by Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL which have been endorsed recently by the President as the type of legislation needed to help this Nation sustain a healthy economic atmosphere.

While some Members of the Congress are always ready to introduce into the RECORD any derogatory news items affecting other Members and especially the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], they seem to ignore or prefer not to see the good work performed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] as well as others in the Congress.

As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor headed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] I believe I can speak from experience when I say that Chairman POWELL is the most cooperative chairman on legislative matters I have ever served with in over 30 years of legislative experiences.

While all of us have faults, by the same token, all of us have virtues. Chairman POWELL's handling of the committee and its work assignments even with a restricted budget can best be judged by the great record of achievement in legislation passed and signed by the President in the fields of Education and Labor.

The United Mine Workers Journal appears to be fully aware of Mr. POWELL's record for the migrant workers, and in the field of fair labor standards legislation.

I present the editorial from the United Mine Workers Journal:

[From the United Mine Workers Journal, December 1, 1964]

#### LABOR COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN POWELL'S PROGRAM FOR 89TH CONGRESS MAKES SENSE

We don't happen to agree with the newspapers, politicians and so-called labor leaders who make a point of picking on Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Democrat, of New York, at every opportunity. Representative POWELL is chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor. He is a good chairman and probably—from labor's standpoint—one of the best the committee ever has had. He certainly is so much better than the Dixiecrat who formerly was chairman that there is no comparison.

Representative POWELL recently outlined a legislative program that includes a 32-hour week, a \$2 an hour Federal minimum wage (it is now \$1.25 an hour) and Federal aid to primary and secondary schools. He also said he would ask the 89th Congress to boost spending on President Johnson's antipoverty program to \$3 billion a year. The Congress appropriated only \$850 million for the program's first year of operation.

POWELL also wants additional protection for migrant workers.

The Powell proposals made good sense to us. We would even go farther on some of the proposals.

Certainly a shorter workweek must come eventually. Certainly a Federal minimum wage of \$2 an hour is not out of line with reality. Certainly aid to education is a must. Certainly the antipoverty program will remain just a pilot program until Congress appropriates enough money to make a real dent in long-term, technological unemployment. Certainly migrant workers are at the bottom of our economic ladder and need all the help they can get from the Federal Government.

We say more power to ADAM CLAYTON POWELL. We need more men in Congress with the guts to stand for what is right.

#### CRIME AND CORRECTIONAL REHABILITATION

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] may

extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to help meet one of the most critical needs of our time. As this Congress already knows, much has been accomplished in the field of vocational rehabilitation; in large part because of the well-designed program of Federal assistance. Yet within this field there is a neglected area, the area of correctional rehabilitation, and today there is a need for an objective, thorough and nationwide analysis and reevaluation of the extent and means of resolving the critical shortage of qualified manpower in the field of correctional rehabilitation.

Last week President Johnson in his state of the Union message called the Nation's attention to this matter when he reiterated the right of every citizen to feel secure in his home and on the streets of his community and when he expressed his desire for the recommendations and constructive efforts of the Congress in attacking the national problem of crime and delinquency. I hope that many of us will rise to this challenge, since crime and delinquency indeed constitute a problem of increasing seriousness and magnitude in a society characterized by sharp increases in population, growing concentrations of people in cities and towns, industrialization, automation, assimilation of minority and immigrant groups in the American middle class, and changes in cultural values. All these developments have wide implications for the incidence and nature of crime and delinquency.

For example, behavior once regarded as normal in a largely rural and pioneer society, such as discharge of firearms in village streets or the taking of a small amount of farm produce from fields, is now regarded as illegal in a more crowded world. This is true because the danger of wounding another individual or of having one's crop ruined, has been increased by the sharp rise and concentration of population. Industrialization has brought an enormous number of new crimes never known to an agrarian world, such as stock swindles, pure food and drug law violations, and a host of other offenses. Minority and immigrant groups, with predominantly non-middle-class values, have swelled the crime rates because of their lack of understanding of and adjustment to our modern American world. Too often, they lack the resources or skills to employ legal counsel or other kinds of help to minimize prosecution for offenses sometimes committed out of ignorance or apathy.

The United States of the 1960's is not necessarily a less moral society than the United States of the 1760's. In fact, the general level of moral and ethical behavior may well be far higher. The problem is rather that our citizens today face a more complex world in a more crowded country with more laws and more opportunities to violate the laws.



Our approaches to crime today may therefore need to be tailored to a different world. The very causes may be different and the methods of prevention and control may need to be different.

This is not to suggest that we should simply tolerate more misconduct or law violations, or that we should drop all our laws from the statute books. Such actions may reduce official crime statistics, and indeed many laws may need to be dropped for various reasons. But failure to prosecute for law violations or removal of offenses from the statute books obviously would attack symptoms rather than causes.

I suggest that our approaches to crime and delinquency control have been very primitive and groping in comparison with our approach to other social problems such as mental health or public health because we have never seriously undertaken to provide the kind and number of personnel required for workable prevention and control programs. We would never for a moment imagine that good public health laws or preventive vaccines or sanitation laws alone would insure good public health. Our attention is directed immediately to establishing enough facilities and resources to turn out an adequate number of qualified physicians, nurses, and other personnel. We think also of ways to induce them to enter public health careers and to remain there. Yet we have naively assumed in our halting and uncertain attempts to prevent and control crime that good laws and a great many institutions and jails alone should do the job.

Let us remember too that all our people are entitled to rehabilitative services when they have committed offenses, both because they are people in need as well as because curing their problems will also protect the rest of us. Research shows that the vast majority of offenders have remediable physical, mental, emotional, or other defects.

The American system of criminal justice, and its counterpart for children and youth in the juvenile courts, has received increasing attention in recent years as a part of our striving toward equality of opportunity and justice for all our people. This attention has so far been directed toward revising the antiquated criminal and juvenile codes, toward improving law-enforcement facilities, toward updating archaic bail bond requirements, and toward strengthening judicial and legal processes.

But there is a serious gap in our remedial approaches so far. We have failed to give adequate attention to the services and facilities for the redirection and treatment of identified and adjudicated offenders, adult and juvenile. Our prisons remain overcrowded, poorly staffed, and subject to riots and disturbances. Our probation services are so inadequate that proponents of the juvenile court philosophy claim that such inadequacies have prevented any real testing of the juvenile court idea. Training schools for delinquents are notoriously poor in program and services, with very few exceptions. Parole staffs in most of our States have enormous caseloads and are ill equipped to offer constructive

guidance. Private correctional agencies, planning and prevention programs, camps, halfway houses, and other correctional machinery are far more promising in their hopes than successful in their accomplishments.

There is fairly clear evidence, and a growing consensus, that the major key to genuine and lasting improvement of correctional services lies in the substantial increase of well-qualified personnel who will enter permanent career service in prisons, probation, parole, and other correctional programs. Good correctional laws, sound program planning, and innovative and promising services are only as effective as the people who will put meaning into the laws, activate the plans, and staff the services.

Unfortunately, to date our interest has been only in devising and demonstrating new laws, new techniques, and new approaches. A comparatively small number of highly qualified personnel have moved around from new project to new project, "testing out" these new ideas. But, as they move on to newer and more exciting programs, each of the previous demonstrations has faded into comparative oblivion. There has been no permanent well-qualified cadre of personnel to pick up on the "demonstrated" idea.

We will never capitalize on our research findings in crime and delinquency until we have enough skilled rehabilitation and prevention personnel. For example, we know that over 90 percent of our offenders shift back and forth from legitimate to illicit careers at one time or another and are not genuinely "career criminals." This 90 percent or so can therefore be potentially directed into permanently legitimate careers. Yet there are only 50 full-time psychiatrists in all the prisons and reformatories serving adult offenders in the Nation, a ratio of approximately 1 psychiatrist to 4,400 offenders. How much genuine rehabilitation can any one person, no matter how qualified, be expected to bring about in such a small army of offenders?

The situation with respect to psychologists is little better, about 1 to 2,000. And there is 1 teacher for every 400 prisoners.

Research evidence indicates that such a drastic shortage of professional personnel has alarming consequences. Too few professionals may be worse than none at all. Prison education, for example, contributes significantly to postrelease success only when the education is extensive and intensive, and a small amount of education impairs postrelease prospects by inspiring unrealistic job aspirations.

Is it any cause for wonder, with such shocking lack of qualified personnel to steer offenders into productive careers, that the value of property stolen in 1963 was \$785 million, and, when the cost of police court and correctional services are added, the total cost of crime exceeded \$2 billion a year? Is it any cause for wonder that since 1958 crime has increased five times faster than the population growth? Is it any cause for wonder that the population of the prisons, reformatories, training schools, jails, and workhouses on any given day reaches almost 400,000?

Yet research clearly shows that the prison employee who has the greatest reformatory influence on the offender is the one who is able and prepared to demonstrate sincere and sustained concern for and confidence in the offender's rehabilitation.

Recognizing the critical need for attention to problems of recruitment and retention of a large cadre of well-qualified and professionally prepared men and women in crime prevention and control services, I have encouraged the national organizations interested in correctional manpower and training to meet together and to provide the Congress with an analysis of needs and a blueprint for action. They have followed these suggestions. In June 1964, 61 organizations sent almost a hundred official delegates to an Arden House conference which was the result of 2 years of planning, writing, and discussions. A blueprint for action at State, Federal, and non-governmental levels was agreed upon, and I am including a copy of one of the decisions of that conference as a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

#### JOINT COMMISSION ON MANPOWER AND TRAINING

Many of the action proposals being considered by the Arden House Conference on Manpower and Training for Corrections cannot be undertaken by existing organizations alone for a variety of reasons. Many of these proposals require a degree of unity and cohesiveness in the field of corrections which will take staff time and concentrated effort to attain. Other activities lie closer to the objectives of the existing organizations or have higher priority. Funds and staff time in existing organizations are lacking. Some proposals require studies, co-ordinated recruitment campaigns, liaison with many organizations. Again, much concentrated effort will be needed. For all these reasons a joint commission whose interests and activities will be in the area of correctional manpower and training should be established.

#### THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A JOINT COMMISSION

A Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training should be established for a 3-year period.

#### TASKS

This joint commission should:

- (a) Identify the goals of corrections;
- (b) Identify the several tasks to be performed to achieve these goals;
- (c) Identify the knowledge, skills, and other qualifications needed to perform the tasks;
- (d) Identify the preparation necessary to achieve these skills;
- (e) Identify the disciplines which should contribute to, and the professions which should take responsibility for, the preparation of correctional personnel;
- (f) Take an inventory of present correctional jobs and project future needs;
- (g) Inventory and identify existing and needed resources for training;
- (h) Promote vigorous recruitment activities by the various professions;
- (i) Promote the development of added training resources;
- (j) Take such other action as in its opinion will further the cause of correctional manpower and training.

#### MEMBERSHIP

The membership of the joint commission should be composed of representatives of the various national and regional organizations related to the correctional field, and members at large from the communications me-

dia, business, industry, labor, and other key groups in the Nation.

#### FINANCING

The joint commission should be financed by public and voluntary funds.

#### THE INTERIM COMMITTEE

The five sponsoring organizations are hereby authorized by the Arden House Conference on Manpower and Training for Corrections to establish an interim committee composed of representatives of these sponsoring organizations and others as appropriate, to implement the formation of the joint commission.

As this indicates, one outstanding decision was to establish a 3-year Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training to compile the known data about correctional manpower to accumulate new findings, and to launch a massive national action program at all levels and in all parts of the Nation. I have given my full support to the group planning this joint commission. As the commission arrives at a point of consensus as to detailed plans and programs, I shall propose a White House conference to launch the national action program in this field.

It is my sincere conviction that a carefully planned multidisciplinary effort such as this involving all the national groups and bodies is a far more promising venture for leadership in crime prevention and control in a democratic society than any narrowly based effort involving a single approach, a single philosophy, or a single discipline. I urge the Congress to support what is truly one of the great democratic action programs of our times to alleviate a serious and growing social problem.

The bill which I have introduced today would amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act and would provide a comprehensive 3-year study of current and anticipated needs for all levels of personnel in the correctional field, a study of current and anticipated requirements for educational and training facilities, a study of recruitment and retention of personnel, a study of curriculum changes in undergraduate and professional education, and a thorough review of the changing trends and developments in correctional tasks and correctional training. Known as the Correctional Rehabilitation Study Act of 1965, the legislation provides a \$500,000 appropriation for the first year of the study and \$800,000 for each of the 2 succeeding years. Additional funds are being sought from a number of foundations. The act is fully backed by over 60 national organizations which approved the study at an Arden House Conference on Manpower and Training for Corrections in June 1964. It has the support of the Federal agencies concerned with correctional rehabilitation, and the national Governors' conference will shortly consider a resolution supporting the act as recommended by the Council of State Governments.

#### THE PROBLEM OF THE MINUTEMEN

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee to make the committee's first order of business in 1965 a deep and thorough investigation of an organization known as the Minutemen.

As anyone who read the newspapers knows, this organization encourages and importunes its members to own firearms and to become proficient in the use of them, and to force governmental policies by violent means. In my opinion, nothing can be more un-American than that.

Following the recent presidential election, the head of the Minutemen, Robert De Pugh stated:

The course for all conservatives now is to join the Minutemen's secret underground army for training as America's last line of defense against communism.

The November issue of *On Target*, which is the official publication of the Minutemen, flatly declares:

The hopes of millions of Americans that the Communist tide could be stopped with ballots rather than bullets have been turned into dust.

It goes on to state:

Among the weak-kneed conservatives, many will be shaking their heads sadly and saying "we simply must win in 1968." I hope the readers of this newspaper are not naive. We are not going to have a free election in 1968.

The above-mentioned Mr. De Pugh in an open bid for subversion has stated:

The Communists are winning by infiltration, subversion, and psychological warfare. We must turn our enemies own tactics against them.

Lest anyone think these wild men do not mean business, I remind you that, according to the *New York Times*, since the organization of the Minutemen 4 years ago individual members have been charged for violating firearm statutes, and a wide variety of weapons have been confiscated.

The *Times* article states:

Membership is secret, but has been variously estimated at a few thousand to 100,000. The current campaign is for an army of a million operating in guerrilla bands of a dozen or so each.

Mr. De Pugh said last summer that there were more than 26,000 Minutemen and that each member supplied his own rifle, shotgun, sidearms and other survival equipment. Each member, he has said, is required to fire at least 500 rounds of ammunition annually at target practice.

We are, of course, united in our unremitting opposition to communism. The time has now come to make it crystal clear that under the guise of anticommunism, no extreme rightwing fascist group will be allowed to threaten the peace and tranquility of our beloved Nation.

#### APPALACHIA PROGRAM IS MOST URGENT NEED

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOELLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson outlined in his state of the Union address an imaginative program designed to keep America "free, growing and full of hope." This is a laudable goal, indeed. It is one which all thoughtful persons can endorse and work toward. For example, the need for a comprehensive, low-cost hospital care program for the aged is absolutely necessary and, I might say, long overdue. Our senior citizens have contributed much to the growth and prosperity of this great Nation. They must not now be forgotten. We cannot allow them to be overwhelmed by the staggering costs of illness and infirmity. Nor can we afford to shirk our responsibility to the generation now coming up. No nation can be any greater than its own system of education. I support the President's call for a far-reaching program to improve the quality of public education from the preschool years on through the college years. Surely, we owe that much to our sons and daughters.

I am in easy agreement with the administration's desire to effectively combat the pollution that is fouling the air we breathe and poisoning the waters of our rivers and streams. Contamination is a growing menace, one that must be solved in the interest of health and for the preservation of our dwindling natural resources.

The President's recommendation for substantial reductions in burdensome excise taxes will be widely applauded. Some of these temporary taxes have been on the statute books since World War II, and can now be reduced or eliminated altogether.

As one who believes that the small farmer is the backbone of our country, I was especially glad to hear the President call for a thorough review of our agricultural program. Without effective Federal assistance, I am apprehensive that the heavy numbers of small farmers being forced off the land may grow progressively worse.

All the recommendations I have discussed, and still others under consideration, are necessary. I support them in fact and principle. But, Mr. Speaker, no program, no goal of this administration is more urgently essential than the revitalization of that region of America known as Appalachia.

While the Nation as a whole is experiencing the longest and most dramatic economic boom in history, Appalachia is mired in grinding poverty and chilling despair. It alone of all the regions of America is being denied the



blessings of our more fruitful and abundant society.

Appalachia cuts through parts of 11 States, including my own area of Ohio, and Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Kentucky, Tennessee, and on into the hill country of Alabama.

I know the people of Appalachia as well as any man does, and, perhaps, better than most. They are a proud and independent people. They are willing to work and work hard. I think most of us recognize that the economic problems of these people cannot be met and solved by them alone. Their plight arises not out of any lack of self-reliance, or out of any lack of individualism on their part. It stems, rather, from the complexities of a changing society; it stems from the underdevelopment of the region in which they live, and from the steady march of progress in industrial America which has made obsolete many of the skills and trades of yesteryear.

Industrial progress is sometimes a two-edged sword. It cuts both ways. While benefitting the many, it can sometimes have disastrous effect on certain segments of our population. The coal mining industry serves as a specific example of what I am talking about.

For generations, many of the men of Appalachia worked in the coalfields of southern Ohio, Kentucky, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Alabama. It was the No. 1 industry.

But, automation, changing heating methods and increased use of diesel fuels served to blight a good part of the coal region. Of the multiple thousands of miners gainfully employed in Appalachia just a few years ago, a staggering number have been forced out of their jobs and, in many cases, onto the relief rolls. The same fate even now awaits hundreds and thousands of other miners in Appalachia.

Many of these people had toiled in the coal mines since their earliest working days. They had no trade to fall back on. So they unwillingly joined the ranks of the more or less permanently unemployed.

More than 15 million people live in Appalachia. It is a region characterized, in part at least, by low incomes and high unemployment, by low educational achievement, and below average standards of living. To be specific:

Appalachia accounts for 35 percent of the unemployment in all the Nation's redevelopment areas, from Florida to Alaska, from Maine to Hawaii.

Incomes in Appalachia are up to 80 percent below the national average.

One in every five of Appalachia's 15 million inhabitants is subsisting on commodity doles or food stamp welfare.

This is not the kind of America I want. It is not the kind of America that you want.

The assertion by some that Congress should do no more for Appalachia than it has done for other, more fortunate regions of America does not impress me. It smacks of Anatole France's satirical statement that the law in its majestic equality forbids the rich, as well as the poor, to sleep under bridges, to beg in

the streets, to steal bread for the dinner table.

We of this Congress have the opportunity to lend a helping hand in time of dire emergency to the people of Appalachia, who deserve far better than they have been getting.

Appalachia can be helped along the road to economic recovery by the legislation which I have introduced today. It is identical to H.R. 4, which was introduced on January 4 by the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Public Works, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON]. Let me assure you that this is no giveaway program. The bread that we are being asked to cast upon the waters will come back many times over.

If Appalachia's economy merely equaled the national average—and passage of this bill will start it in that direction—if Appalachia's economy equaled the national average, \$12 billion a year could be added to our gross national product through increased retail sales.

If Appalachia's economy equaled the national average—and passage of this measure will start it in that direction—if this happened, \$5.2 billion would be added each year to your country's annual rate of personal income.

If Appalachia's economy matched the national average—and passage of this bill will start it in that direction—another billion dollars worth of new housing starts could be made in America each year.

Most assuredly, what is good for Appalachia is good for the United States.

The objective of this bill is to provide a Federal investment program that will assist Appalachia toward fuller participation in our Nation's robust economic growth. This bill authorizes an appropriation of \$840 million for the Appalachian development highway system—a system that will open up the most remote areas of Appalachia to modern, industrial America.

Appalachia lies just beyond the reaches of the greatest concentration of wealth and population in this Nation. But its lack of adequate transportation facilities has effectively isolated it from the broad sweep of industrial growth which has blessed most of our Nation in the years since World War II. We all know that industry does not and cannot go into areas that lack first-rate distribution routes.

As the President's Commission on Appalachia has said:

Its [Appalachia's] penetration by an adequate transportation network is the first requisite of its full participation in industrial America.

I want to emphasize that the Appalachian States are not seeking something for nothing. They are ready and willing to provide \$360 million from their own scarce funds to help finance the highway building program—a program acknowledged to be the first requisite for bringing better times to Appalachia and its people.

The legislation I propose would establish the Appalachia Regional Commission, consisting of the Governors of each

Appalachian State and one Federal representative. This Commission, made up of the men who best know the problems of Appalachia, would prepare plans and programs needed to revitalize that region of our country. The Commission would guarantee local and State participation in all phases of the program. It would be a politically bipartisan body of both Democratic and Republican Governors.

Another important provision provides Federal assistance in modernizing the health facilities of Appalachia. The low income of Appalachia is reflected in the lack, if not nonexistence, of the kind of health facilities that most Americans take for granted. The committee report lists this finding:

Sound health services can play as much a role in the economic development of a region as any other instrument of development. Without such service, no community or sub-region can hope to attract modern industry. In many sections of Appalachia, this problem is particularly acute. The low income in these sections impairs a reasonable support of private medicine and the tax base necessary for even rudimentary public health facilities is nonexistent.

My bill provides for grants for the development, equipment, and operation of multicounty demonstration health facilities, including hospitals, regional health diagnostic and treatment centers and other facilities necessary for good health.

Mr. Speaker, I urgently and earnestly urge this great House to proceed with all deliberative speed toward enactment of this essential legislation. It will give new hope to the people of Appalachia. It will complement the other farsighted and far-reaching economic programs which Congress, in its wisdom, has authorized for the good of the Nation during the past 4 years.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. JOHNSON of California (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for the week of January 11, 1965, on account of official business.

Mr. HARSHA (at the request of Mr. LAIRD), for the week of January 11, 1965, on account of official business.

Mr. JONES of Alabama (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for the week of January 11, 1965, on account of official business.

Mr. WRIGHT, for January 11 through January 14, 1965, on account of Public Works Subcommittee inspection of west coast floods.

Mr. KING of New York (at the request of Mr. FORD), beginning January 13, 1965, for an indefinite period, on account of personal reasons.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN (at the request of Mr. LAIRD), for the week of January 11, 1965, on account of official business.

Mr. ELLSWORTH (at the request of Mr. FORD), for today and through January 14, 1965, on account of death in his family.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legisla-

tive program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. WHITE of Idaho, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. SIKES, for 20 minutes, on Wednesday, January 13.

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON), for 30 minutes, January 12, 1965; for 60 minutes, January 13, 1965; and for 20 minutes, January 14, 1965.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BLATNIK.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PELLY.

Mr. POFF.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FARNUM) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. POWELL.

Mr. CALLAN.

Mr. VANIK.

Mr. HEBERT.

#### ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 3. Joint resolution extending the date for transmission of the budget and the Economic Report.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 12, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

304. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report on the Puerto Rican hurricane relief loans, pursuant to section 6 (45 Stat. 1067) and (70 Stat. 525); to the Committee on Agriculture.

305. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 8(e) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

306. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a report showing by age and grade above major, officers on flying status and receiving flight pay as of August 31, 1964, and average monthly flight pay authorized for period March 1 through August 31, 1964, pursuant to 301(g), title 37, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

307. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize payment of

special allowances to dependents of members of the uniformed services to offset expenses incident to their evacuation, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

308. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to authorize payment of incentive pay for the performance of hazardous duty on the flight deck of an aircraft carrier"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

309. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide gold star lapel buttons for the next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lost or lose their lives in war or as a result of cold war incidents"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

310. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the unnecessary cost to the Government due to excessive rentals for electronic data processing equipment at Lockheed Missiles & Space Co., Sunnyvale, Calif., Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

311. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize a contribution to certain inhabitants of the Ryukyu Islands for death and injury of persons, and for use of and damage to private property, arising from acts and omissions of the U.S. Armed Forces, or members thereof, after August 15, 1945, and before April 28, 1952"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

312. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the regulation of rates and practices of air carriers and foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

313. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend provisions of law relating to the settlement of admiralty claims"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

314. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to transfer certain functions of the Secretary of the Treasury and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

315. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Porter F. Sheldon, U.S. Air Force"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

316. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for relief of Capt. Richard A. Ingram and Capt. Arthur R. Sprott, Jr., U.S. Air Force"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

317. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for relief of Lt. Col. John E. McRoberts and T. Sgt. Harold C. Fisher, Jr., U.S. Air Force"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

318. A letter from the Commission, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions which the Immigration and Naturalization Service has approved according to the beneficiaries of such petition first preference classification under the act, pursuant to section 204(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

319. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend chapter 147 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense, or his

designee, to dispose of telephone facilities by negotiated sale"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

320. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the Outer Continental Shelf, known as the Corpus Christi offshore warning area, for defense purposes, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

321. A letter from the Sergeant at Arms, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting a statement exhibiting the several sums drawn by him pursuant to sections 78 and 80 of title 2, United States Code, the application and disbursement of the sums, and balances, if any, remaining in his hands, pursuant to the provisions of title 2, United States Code, section 84; to the Committee on House Administration.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 2168. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.R. 2169. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 2170. A bill to establish a new program of grants for public works projects undertaken by local governments in the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 2171. A bill to amend the act relating to the multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands in order to provide that certain varieties of sand and gravel shall be considered as valuable mineral deposits under the mining laws of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 2172. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make extraordinary grants for acquisition of rights-of-way; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 2173. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make loans to Indians for purchase of certain real property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2174. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to require additional precautionary measures aboard certain aircraft in the interest of the safety of the traveling public; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2175. A bill to amend title XI of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide that certain provisions of insurance contracts covering loss of life or personal injury of passengers being transported in air transportation shall be null and void; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 2176. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property



to the county of Dare, State of North Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURLISON:

H.R. 2177. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CALLAWAY:

H.R. 2178. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 2179. A bill to create and prescribe the duties of a Commission To Investigate Electoral College Reform; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 2180. A bill to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 2181. A bill making Columbus Day a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2182. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the rate of duty on brooms made of broom corn; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2183. A bill to provide for the right of persons to be represented by attorneys in matters before Federal agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2184. A bill to establish a U.S. mint in Lake or Cook County, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 2185. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2186. A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion and Diversification Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 2187. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide for a mid-decade census of population, unemployment, and housing in years 1966 and 1975 and every 10 years thereafter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2188. A bill to provide certain adjustments in amounts of group life and group accidental death and dismemberment insurance under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 in accordance with the current salary structure for Government officers and employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 2189. A bill to amend section 203(k) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the transfer of surplus property for certain uses by educational institutions; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 2190. A bill to repeal the excise tax on business machines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2191. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to permit the division of a corporation into two corporations on a fully non pro rata basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 2192. A bill to provide aid to States for educational purposes only; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 2193. A bill to strengthen democratic processes respecting the calling of strikes, to protect employees against unjustifiable pay losses from strikes, to protect employers from needless production

interruptions arising out of strikes contrary to the wishes of employees, and to minimize industrial strife interfering with the flow of commerce and the national security by amending the National Labor Relations Act to require economic strikes to be authorized by a secret ballot; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2194. A bill to limit and prevent certain concerted activities by labor organizations which interfere with or obstruct or impede the free production of goods for commerce or the free flow thereof in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2195. A bill to extend the application of the Classification Act of 1949 to certain positions in, and employees of, the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2196. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the value of a decedent's real property (or interest in real property) which was used as a ranch or farm or in some other trade or business may at the election of the executor be determined, for estate tax purposes, solely by reference to its value for such use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 2197. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to permit loss of goodwill to be taken into account in computing the amount of the relocation payment which may be made to a business concern or nonprofit organization displaced by an urban renewal project, and to increase the maximum amount of such payment; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2198. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2199. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to increase the amount of outside income which a survivor annuitant may earn without deduction from his or her annuity thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2200. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on sporting goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2201. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2202. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2203. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 2204. A bill to provide for participation of the United States in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Fla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 2205. A bill to amend section 901(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide for the carriage by U.S.-flag commercial vessels of certain cargo in excess of the 50 percent gross tonnage limitation contained in such section; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 2206. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 2207. A bill to allow a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, of expenses for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 2208. A bill to modify the flood control project on the Scioto River, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2209. A bill to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.R. 2210. A bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 2211. A bill to provide for continuity and support of study, research, and development of programs for peaceful uses in science, commerce, and other activities related to Antarctica, which shall include, but shall not be limited to, gathering, evaluating, correlating, and dispersing of information and knowledge obtained from exploration, research, and other mediums relating to weather, communications travel, and other areas of information; also to coordinate Antarctic activities among those agencies of the U.S. Government and private institutions interested in or concerned directly with the promotion, advancement, increase, and diffusion of knowledge of the Antarctic; and to direct and administer U.S. Antarctic programs in the national interest; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2212. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make disposition of geothermal steam and associated geothermal resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2213. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULL:

H.R. 2214. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt schoolbuses from the manufacturers' excise tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H.R. 2215. A bill to create the Freedom Commission and the Freedom Academy, to conduct research to develop an integrated body of operational knowledge in the political, psychological, economic, technological, and organizational areas to increase the non-military capabilities of the United States in the global struggle between freedom and communism, to educate and train Government personnel and private citizens to understand and implement this body of knowledge, and also to provide education and training for foreign students in these areas of knowledge under appropriate conditions; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 2216. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to allow containers for certain petroleum products and derivatives to be temporarily imported without payment of duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 2217. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 2218. A bill to provide for a comprehensive, long-range, and coordinated national program in oceanography, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 2219. A bill to amend section 1913 of title 18, United States Code, to make clear that the prohibition against lobbying with appropriated funds applies to the heads of executive departments and agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2220. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Court of Veterans' Appeals and to prescribe its jurisdiction and functions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2221. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2222. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Federal Taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2223. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer, spouse, or dependent who is a student at an institution of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2224. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for medical, legal, and related expenses incurred in connection with the adoption of a child by the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2225. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer or spouse who has had a laryngectomy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 2226. A bill to amend section 6(b) of the Area Redevelopment Act to permit the 10 percent of the financing of industrial projects required to be met by a local public or semipublic body to be repaid over the same period as the Federal share of such financing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2227. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a tax credit for expenses of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2228. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from \$600 to \$1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemptions for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H.R. 2229. A bill to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital in southern New Jersey; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska:

H.R. 2230. A bill to amend section 1(14) (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 2231. A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion and Diversification Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOELLER:

H.R. 2232. A bill to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 2233. A bill to amend section 610 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to prohibit the serving of alcoholic beverages to airline passengers while in flight; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2234. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 2235. A bill to permit certain Government employees to elect to receive compensation in accordance with section 401 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 in lieu of certain compensation at a saved rate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 2236. A bill to authorize the temporary release of 100,000 short tons of copper from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 2237. A bill to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, so as to provide authorization of 4 years' constructive service credit to veterinary officers now on active duty with the uniformed services, and that those veterinarians hereinafter appointed as veterinary officers, be so credited; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2238. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp honoring the coal miners and coal industry of America; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2239. A bill to provide assistance to certain States bordering the Mississippi River in the construction of the Great River Road to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RACE:

H.R. 2240. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RONAN:

H.R. 2241. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 2242. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Court of Veterans' Appeals and to prescribe its jurisdiction and functions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 2243. A bill to amend Public Law 88-573, to permit the Farmers Home Administration to expend certain appropriated funds for recreational development; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 2244. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H.R. 2245. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct Gilbert Dam and Reservoir on the Buffalo River in Searcy County, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2246. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct Pine Mountain Dam on Lee Creek, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2247. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to extend to veterans of the induction period certain benefits enjoyed by veterans of periods of war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 2248. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to make that act applicable to smoking products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2249. A bill to amend the act of June 29, 1940, relating to the administration of the Washington National Airport, to transfer to the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency certain additional real property of the United States to facilitate the expansion of such airport for general aviation purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2250. A bill to provide that for the purpose of disapproval by the President each provision of an appropriation bill shall be considered a separate bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALKER of New Mexico:

H.R. 2251. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 2252. A bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 2253. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus personal property to State agencies for use by volunteer firefighting organizations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 2254. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Adm. Henry Forry Picking National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2255. A bill to provide for the establishment of national cemeteries in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2256. A bill to impose quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 2257. A bill to provide a 1-year period during which certain veterans may be granted national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2258. A bill to protect funds invested in series E U.S. saving bonds from inflation and to encourage persons to provide for their own security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 2259. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to conduct a survey of all streams which drain directly to the Pacific Ocean from San Mateo County, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 2260. A bill to amend the act of February 28, 1958, relating to the withdrawal, reservation, or restriction of public lands, insofar as it applies to procedures for restriction on mineral leasing in the Outer Continental Shelf, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 2261. A bill to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the Outer Continental Shelf (known as the Eastern Test Range) for defense purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 2262. A bill to provide for the right of persons to be represented by attorneys in



matters before Federal agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 2263. A bill to provide for an objective, thorough and nationwide analysis and reevaluation of the extent and means of resolving the critical shortage of qualified manpower in the field of correctional rehabilitation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 2264. A bill to authorize the coordinated development of the water resources of the Pacific Southwest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 2265. A bill to limit the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell any food grains and feed grains owned or controlled by it; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 2266. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims resulting from an explosion at a U.S. ordnance plant in Bowie County, Tex., on July 8, 1963; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H.J. Res. 163. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.J. Res. 164. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to enable the Congress to function effectively in time of emergency or disaster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.J. Res. 165. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the second Sunday in September of each year as Bataan Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.J. Res. 166. Joint resolution to provide for an urban renewal code enforcement project in the Adams-Morgan area, and to encourage and assist rehabilitation of homes and businesses in such area; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.J. Res. 167. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 168. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to place a limit on the extent to which social security taxes (or taxes under any similar Federal retirement or disability insurance system) may be increased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 169. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALL:

H.J. Res. 170. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.J. Res. 171. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.J. Res. 172. Joint resolution to create a Joint Committee on Executive Orders; to the Committee on Rules.

H.J. Res. 173. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.J. Res. 174. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.J. Res. 175. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.J. Res. 176. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAGGONER:

H.J. Res. 177. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.J. Res. 178. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES:

H. Con. Res. 86. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H. Con. Res. 87. Concurrent resolution to request the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FARBSTAIN:

H. Con. Res. 88. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to prosecutions for war crimes in the Federal Republic of Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 89. Concurrent resolution to favor the establishment of an international living museum of anthropology and ethnography; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the distribution and viewing of the film, "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," prepared by the U.S. Information Agency on the late President Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MINISH:

H. Con. Res. 91. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the adoption by the United Nations of a universal declaration opposing religious intolerance and discriminatory practices; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H. Res. 97. Resolution authorizing a Captive Nations Committee; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 98. Resolution amending clause 2(a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MINISH:

H. Res. 99. Resolution condemning persecution by the Soviet Union of persons because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. Res. 100. Resolution establishing a special Committee on Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 2267. A bill for the relief of Thelma Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2268. A bill for the relief of Zita Brackenridge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2269. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe DiGiovanni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 2270. A bill for the relief of Moapa Valley Water Co., of Logandale, Nev.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 2271. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helene (Papadopoulos) Chappell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2272. A bill for the relief of Helen Stathopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 2273. A bill for the relief of Nicanor Sabino and Victoria Y. Sabino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 2274. A bill for the relief of Dr. Sophocles Sakellariou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 2275. A bill for the relief of Clara S. Chann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 2276. A bill for the relief of Mo Tseng Hsu and Cheng Hsing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 2277. A bill for the relief of Louis Stephen Edouard St. Laurent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 2278. A bill for the relief of Sophie Yancopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2279. A bill for the relief of Elisa Bonifacio Bordonaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2280. A bill for the relief of Eleftheria Ralsopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 2281. A bill for the relief of Krystyna Zielinski (formerly Krystyna Widz); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTAIN:

H.R. 2282. A bill for the relief of Doris Stain Idolly Patten and Radiance Eleanore Gabourel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2283. A bill for the relief of Amnon and Ruth Kammer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2284. A bill for the relief of Jan Piotr Spolnik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 2285. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Concetta Cioffi Carson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 2286. A bill for the relief of Dedrick A. Maanum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 2287. A bill for the relief of Dr. Vida D'Souza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2288. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose Castro Sicut; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 2289. A bill for the relief of Ibrahim Takla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 2290. A bill for the relief of Charlotte Schulz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2291. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Shi Ming Hu; Miss Chen, Shau-Ley; Miss Cheng, Shau-Nee; and Mrs. Hu, Lai Shu-Jee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 2292. A bill for the relief of Dr. Virginia Valenzuela; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2293. A bill for the relief of Sesinando S. Calalang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2294. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Jean Petrou and Rachel Arbib Harari Petrou, husband and wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 2295. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kermanoochi Iskander Artinian Parsekian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2296. A bill for the relief of Rafael T. Raad and his wife, Anaísa Alves Raad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2297. A bill for the relief of Fanny Mar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 2298. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration to quitclaim certain property in Jackson County, to Skyline Churches Cemetery, a corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 2299. A bill for the relief of Robert L. Yates and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOVE:

H.R. 2300. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Voula Rozakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 2301. A bill for the relief of Sister Alfreda (Cesira Calcagni); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2302. A bill for the relief of Sister Antonia (Ida Conforto); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 2303. A bill for the relief of Ernest J. Carlin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 2304. A bill for the relief of Aurora Macedo de Faria de Ornelas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 2305. A bill for the relief of Zenaida Z. Lazaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 2306. A bill for the relief of Leonardo Mazarese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2307. A bill for the relief of Isola Dias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2308. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Tabile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2309. A bill for the relief of Kathleen Lothian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2310. A bill for the relief of Stamatios Coutsoumbaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2311. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Sicurella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2312. A bill for the relief of Maria Freni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2313. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Stellario; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2314. A bill for the relief of Emmanuel Georgious Sopassakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2315. A bill for the relief of Estena Adella Grant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2316. A bill for the relief of Carl McDonald Farrell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2317. A bill for the relief of (Jimmy) Ching Wu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2318. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Vatalidis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2319. A bill for the relief of Zenaida Maano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2320. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Lentini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2321. A bill for the relief of Herminia Concha Moreno Cortes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2322. A bill for the relief of William O'Connor Swainson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2323. A bill for the relief of Nicoletta Esposito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2324. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Koumarianos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2325. A bill for the relief of McField and Mavis Bowman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2326. A bill for the relief of Doris Gunter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2327. A bill for the relief of Rukmin Bachan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2328. A bill for the relief of Kiriakoula Hristoforatu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2329. A bill for the relief of Vilma Angela Roberts (nee Keller); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2330. A bill for the relief of Edward George Roberts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2331. A bill for the relief of Pang Jool Tuck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 2332. A bill for the relief of Antoni Stanislaw Blicharski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2333. A bill for the relief of Antonio Tito and his wife Kalyopi Tito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2334. A bill for the relief of Etsuko Yano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2335. A bill for the relief of Anastasoulas E. Tryfona (Anastasia Efstathios Trifonas); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 2336. A bill for the relief of Mehmet Tahir Kaplan and Sevim Alton Kaplan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 2337. A bill for the relief of Dr. Tapas Kumar Das Gupta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 2338. A bill for the relief of Izhak Sokolski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2339. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ricardo Jara, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2340. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Meliha Cayiloglu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2341. A bill for the relief of Zvi Mordeisky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2342. A bill for the relief of Nachman Erlichman and his wife, Michal Erlichman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 2343. A bill for the relief of Dr. Romeo Puruganan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H.R. 2344. A bill for the relief of Angeliki Krimigis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 2345. A bill for the relief of Pham Thi Ly (also known as Mrs. Hai-Linh Tran); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2346. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tran Kim Lang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2347. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Josip Gojanovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2348. A bill for the relief of Miss Catherine Carlotaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2349. A bill for the relief of Robert Dean Ward; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2350. A bill for the relief of Mr. Seu Seng Tang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2351. A bill for the relief of Teresita Centeno Valdez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2352. A bill for the relief of Mr. Marciano H. Hibi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 2353. A bill for the relief of Shih Chang Wu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 2354. A bill for the relief of William L. Chatelain, U.S. Navy, retired; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2355. A bill for the relief of Harry J. Alker, Jr., and the estate of Alfred A. DuBan, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 2356. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sophia Takacs and Sophia Kondor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2357. A bill for the relief of Domingo Hernandez Valdez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2358. A bill for the relief of Tony Boone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2359. A bill for the relief of Frank Yeny Horne Powlan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELTNER:

H.R. 2360. A bill for the relief of Dr. Antonio R. Perez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

65. By Mr. MOORE: Petition of the City Council of Clarksburg, W. Va., favoring construction of the Stonewall Jackson Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

66. Also, petition of the Water Board of the City of Clarksburg, W. Va., is favoring construction of the Stonewall Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

67. Also, petition of the Weston, W. Va., Rotary Club, favoring construction of the Stonewall Jackson Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

68. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Reginald B. Naugle, Conyngham, Pa., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to a redress of grievance relative to the presidential election; to the Committee on House Administration.

69. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to requesting Congress to discontinue use of the concurrent resolution unless the provisions of article I, section 7, clause 3, U.S. Constitution are adhered to; the Committee on Rules.